Generations Perspective on Individual Motivation Factors in Creating Knowledge Content for Knowledge Sharing Digital Platform Development: Case Study: West Java Province, Indonesia

Samuel and A. F. Hendarman

School of Business and Management, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Tamansari St. No. 64, Bandung, Indonesia

Keywords: ICIB, Knowledge Sharing, New Product Development.

Abstract: In the current era of knowledge, Indonesia's condition is still lagging behind in terms of human resources Human quality is largely determined by the learning method. The traditional method that relies on face-to-face meetings through class media and discussion very limited to support the rapid changes in informational and knowledge. Besides, modern learning method such as E-learning and/or online lectures are very rigid in the curriculum. A new concept was conceived as the development of modern learning methods, namely knowledge-sharing based learning method. This learning method uses a digital platform for knowledge sharing activity. This research hopefully provides an overview of people behavior in West Java Province seen from the perspective of the different generation in sharing knowledge through a digital platform. The study was conducted by reviewing individual factors that influence a person's motivation as a content provider on a digital platform. This model was tested by statistical methods on 300 respondents in West Java Province. Qualitative data is taken to explain the results of quantitative data. This study found that content providers are influenced by the ability of content providers, the pleasure of helping others, fears, the rewards gained, and interpersonal trust.

1   INTRODUCTION

In today's era, information and knowledge stand out as a significant and critical input for growth and survival. Education and training system are important to produce information and knowledge. Current learning methods are traditional and modern learning methods. Traditional learning method has been conducted since ancient age to impart knowledge to others. This method provides a one-way communication system by educators to the learners. As a consequence, learners should attend the classes in person. By looking at the Global Competitiveness Report 2017-2018, Indonesia is ranked 64th for higher education and training pillar and 94th for healthy and primary education pillar that show low traditional learning methods quality in Indonesia. Therefore, the traditional learning method is not enough to chase technology advancement and create competitive human resources. Future of traditional system looks that is not so much secure and no remain so longer because it restricts the learner within boundaries and only teaches basic, but now the world

is globally advanced and new technology comes every next moment so it is very important to develop traditional education change with modern society (Upasana, 2014).

Modern learning method or E-learning refers to learning activities using electronic media and internet technology. It is generally meant for remote learning and distance learning, but can also be used in face to face interaction (Upasana, 2014). Most forms that are used in Indonesia are blended learning as an internal learning materials database at schools, universities, companies, etc. It requires private access. Besides, the other form is MOOC (Massively Online Open Courses). MOOC provides a learning curriculum, materials, and also certificates for qualified learners. Based on DailySocial.id MOOC Survey in 2017, slightly more than half of the respondents have heard of MOOC or online learning (56.11%). However, the participation ratio only around 20%. Most respondents said that they mostly have barriers in time and internet connection (including dropped connections/low connection quality, and expensive data rates). Besides that, they mentioned about an

inaccessible/expensive subject, computer/gadget hardware problems, unavailable/incomplete subjects, and around 17.89% respondents said that they actually have no obstacles, but they just don't want to do MOOC.

By looking at traditional and modern learning method that is not maximum enough, it's an opportunity to make innovation by developing a new form of modern learning method. A new concept was conceived as the development of modern learning methods, namely knowledge-sharing based learning method. This innovation enables knowledge sharing activities among users and accessible to the public through a digital platform. Unlike other E-learning, this platform does not require learners to learn all subjects. Learners can choose by themselves what knowledge that they want to access.

Moreover, the platform will have no use if no one wants to create knowledge contents on it. It is important to understand why people want to share their knowledge. Externalization of knowledge can take place through multimodal interactions, through videos, pictures, blogs, wikis, answering questions or ongoing online conversations (Razmerita et al., 2014). By seeing West Java Province as an organization, the literature has identified factors that affect the organization members' knowledge sharing behavior (King and Marks, 2008; Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002). Deci and Ryan (2000) have distinguished extrinsic and intrinsic motivation of individual factor that gives rise to an action. Intrinsic motivation refers to motivation that is driven by an interest or enjoyment of the task itself or enjoying helping others, and exists within the individual rather than relying on any external pressure or reward. (Razmerita et al., 2016). People who are intrinsically motivated are more likely to engage in the task, as well as work to improve their skills, which will increase their capabilities as well as the organization's productivity (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Extrinsic motivation comes from goal-driven and consideration of cost (effort) – benefit (reward) that leads to a desirable outcome. Knowledge sharing may happen when benefits are perceived as exceed or equal the cost. This is why reward systems are still needed for motivating members to share knowledge. Both of these motivations are the drivers or determinants of knowledge sharing behavior (Wang & Hou, 2015).

Razmerita et al (2016) said that some individual drivers that impact knowledge sharing intentions are enjoying helping others, e.g. (Ma and Chan, 2014; Wasko and Faraj, 2005; Hung et al., 2011; Chennamaneni et al., 2012), knowledge self-efficacy

(Van Acker et al., 2014), and expected organizational rewards and reciprocal benefits (Jeon et al., 2011, Chennamaneni et al., 2012; Lin, 2007). Self-efficacy is defined as "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute courses of actions required to manage prospective situations" (Hsu et al., 2007; Bandura, 1997). Besides, fear has been identified as an important factor that prevents knowledge sharing behavior. Scholarly written articles have included various types of fear (e.g. fear of criticism, fear of giving up power and authority, fear that job security will be reduced, fear of exploitation, fear of personal feedback, fear of losing face or misleading community members (Ardichvili et al., 2003; Šajeva, 2007; Matschke et al., 2014). Lack of time or the time required to engage in knowledge sharing has also been presented in different studies as an important factor that may affect the frequency with which knowledge is shared using social media e.g. (Razmerita et al., 2014).

Another important factor is trust, including an individual level (as an interpersonal trust) and at organizational or different social levels (Hau et al., 2013; Chow and Chan, 2008). Trust can be seen as the belief that other party will behave as expected and not take advantage (Gefen et al., 2003; Hsu et al., 2007). Social trust influences the interaction between employees; how much they want to learn from each other and share their knowledge (Chow & Chan, 2008). According to Hsu et al. (2007), who discuss trust in virtual communities, trust can be classified into economy-based trust, information-based trust, and identification-based trust. Economy-based trust refers to the belief that an individual can get economic advantage from the communities. Information-based trust talks about the security of personal information and also professionalism in using shared information. Identification-based trust refers to refers to the possibility to freely discuss personal issues to which you expect a constructive response (Razmerita et al., 2016).

2 METHODS

This research was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods to get primary data. An online self-administered questionnaire was spread and only accessible for those who aged 18-64 years old and lives in West Java Province. Research samples are taken from eligible educated people who join in the optimization and synchronization team of West Java Province 2018. This team consisted of professors, masters, undergraduates, professionals,

politicals, and consultants from West Java to support government policy planning. As they were trusted by the government, they are expected to be competent and experienced in searching for knowledge. Therefore, their behavior can represent how knowledge people contribute to the knowledge sharing process.

The questionnaire consists of 16 statements using a 5-Likert scale. The Likert scale identifies 1 as a strong disagreement, 2 as a disagreement, 3 as a neutral, 4 as an agreement, and 5 as a strong agreement towards each statement. Table 1 shows the variables that are measured in this research. Then, the qualitative method will be used to validate the result of the quantitative method and to analyze organizations' opinion. The author used an individual-depth-interview method to 3 people from government education and culture department, private learning center, and a company. Otherwise, the secondary data by literature review from books or published journals also will be used to analyze the result of primary data collection.

Table 1: Variables Considered for Research.

	Variables	Questions
	Age	
	Gender	
Intrinsic	Self-efficacy	Q.01 – Q.04
	Enjoying helping others	Q.05 – Q.07
Extrinsic	Fears	Q.08 – Q.09
	Expected reward	Q.10 – Q.13
	Interpersonal trust	Q.14 – Q.16

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Quantitative Results

The results of the questionnaire must be tested to ensure the quality of data. The author conducted validity and reliability test to all respondents by using statistical software. Pearson Correlation Method is used to perform the validity test. Data is valid when Pearson Correlation value is higher than the r table value. Since the number of data is 300 and it is difficult to find r table value for that number, author decide to use 5% level of significance for a two-tailed test and take r table value of df (degree of freedom) equal to 200. Then, all data have the Pearson Correlation value higher than r Table value. Therefore, all data in this questionnaire are valid and can be trusted.

After the author run the validity test, it is needed to also conduct a reliability test to determine the accuracy and consistency of each variable. Guilford

(1956) said that Alpha Cronbach formula could be used to determine the reliability of a criterion (in Priatna, 2008). Data is acceptable if it has an alpha value greater than 0.2. Data is low reliable if it has an alpha value between 0.20 until 0.40. Data is moderate reliable if it has an alpha value between 0.40 until 0.60. Data is highly reliable if it has an alpha value between 0.60 until 0.80. Therefore data is very high reliable if it has an alpha value between 0.80 until 1.00. Then, all data in this questionnaire are reliable. Therefore, all data can represent the behavior of each variable.

This survey is participated by productive people aged 18-64 years old and lives in West Java Province. Respondents are taken from members of the synchronization and optimization team of West Java Governor consist of 52% male and 48% woman in a total of 300 respondents. This research is majorly participated by millennials as they are the most dominant generation in work environment nowadays. Table 2 shows the generation differences chart. Self-efficacy variable will explain about respondents' confidence level in creating knowledge content. From Table 3, respondents almost agree that they were confident in their ability to produce knowledge that is useful to others. Most respondents also almost agree that they have enough experience and expertise to produce knowledge that is useful to others. Then, respondents almost sure that they can respond to or answer the questions that other people ask about the knowledge they share. Furthermore, it is interesting to see that score for Q.04 is the highest among other statements. It may be good for knowledge sharing activity that respondents believe in their capability, but also be humble to learn from other people. But, it can also mean that respondents agree that other people can provide more valuable and useful knowledge than what they share. Baby boomers and Xs have a higher score for self-efficacy variable. They may feel more confident because of their more tacit knowledge and also more access to explicit knowledge. These generations have more experience than the rest. Meanwhile, Millenials and Zs are not confident because they feel inexperienced to share their knowledge.

Variable of enjoying helping others is used by Lin (2007) as he saw that people are encouraged to do something when it creates an immediate impact. Knowledge sharing will show immediate impact when the knowledge recipients receive the knowledge. This result shows that respondents are happy to help others with what they have.

Table 2: Generation Differences Chart in 2018 (source: Battelle for Kids, 2018).

	Baby Boomers	Generation X	Millenials	Generation Z
Birth years	1946 – 1964	1965 – 1979	1980 – 1995	1996 – 2012
Current age	54 – 72	39 – 53	23 – 38	6 – 22
Other names	"Me" Generation	Baby Bust, The Doers	Gen Y, 24/7s, EchoBoomers	iGen, Post-Millenials,
Generation descriptors	Hard-working, loyal, strong work ethic, well-educated, value cooperation, value equal opportunities, extremely loyal to their children, self-worth, organization-loyal, face-to-face communication	Independent, critical thinkers, think globally, value diversity, suspicious of boomer's values, seeks life balance, prefer independence and fewer rules, lack organizational loyalty, technology literate 50/50	Steady work ethic (when it matches them focus), needs constant feedback, technology literate, family-focused, values flexibility and control, impatient, highly socialized, loyalty is to self	Technologically integrated, global, individuality, less-focus, multi-taskers, communicate best by smartphone/e-mail, little loyalty (to brands, organizations, or program/rewards)

Table 3: Average Score of Individual Factors.

Variables	Baby Boomers	Generation X	Millenials	Generation Z	Overall
Self Efficacy	15.90	15.97	15.22	13.68	15.22
Q.01	4.10	4.00	3.77	3.37	3.80
Q.02	4.00	3.88	3.63	3.11	3.65
Q.03	3.81	3.97	3.76	3.24	3.75
Q.04	4.00	4.12	4.05	3.97	4.05
Enjoying Helping Others	12.62	12.54	12.47	12.00	12.45
Q.05	4.14	4.17	4.14	4.03	4.13
Q.06	4.10	4.06	4.12	3.95	4.08
Q.07	4.38	4.30	4.22	4.03	4.22
Fears	5.14	4.96	5.13	5.11	5.08
Q.08	2.38	2.28	2.49	2.68	2.46
Q.09	2.76	2.68	2.63	2.42	2.63
Expected Reward	12.81	13.13	13.67	12.79	13.34
Q.10	3.52	3.62	3.56	3.32	3.54
Q.11	2.90	2.84	3.16	2.76	3.02
Q.12	2.52	2.80	3.04	3.16	2.96
Q.13	3.86	3.87	3.91	3.55	3.85
Interpersonal Trust	9.43	9.14	9.55	8.92	9.37
Q.14	3.19	3.04	3.23	3.05	3.16
Q.15	3.19	3.06	3.16	2.92	3.11
Q.16	3.05	3.04	3.16	2.95	3.10

Respondents know that knowledge sharing activity is also a social activity. Inside, they are motivated to do it when it can help others. Table 3 shows how generations see this variable. The result can be correlated with the level of competition. From that figure, the more mature the generation is, then they will be more help others. Old generations have seen the importance of networking in this life. Networking is really related to knowledge sharing. As a consequence, they tend to survive and win the competition by using good networking and knowledge sharing. In contrast, Zs generation shows

that they do not really enjoy to share knowledge for helping others. They prioritize their own competitive advantage to survive and win.

This variable is very dynamic if it is seen from a generational perspective. Table 3 shows the total score of fears variable from Q.08 and Q.09. Xs generation seems to have the lowest degree of fears, but the score of Q.08 and Q.09 are different. Generation profile of Q.08 shows that time for sharing knowledge of older generations is fewer than the younger generation. Younger generations may have a more significant probability to use their time

to do knowledge sharing. Besides, the generation profile of Q.09 shows that knowledge impact of the older generation is more significant than the younger generations. This phenomenon can be explained by self-efficacy results. The younger generations may feel inexperienced so they argue that their shared knowledge probably make no impact for others. So, we can see the intersection in Table 3 gives information that the older generation may have limited time, but they are sure they able to create impactful shared knowledge. Then, the younger generation may have more time, but they are not sure they able to create impactful shared knowledge.

The second variable of extrinsic motivation is the expected reward variable. This variable will explain how people are moved by rewards. Rewards are one of an attractive variable for almost everything because human wants to do something when there are some rewards for them. As a new product, it is important to attract some content providers to create contents. The rewards in the digital platform usually are new friends, reputation, income money, and discussion forum (community). Although many respondents choose a neutral option, respondents are more interested in the discussion forum and getting new friends to compare to reputation and income money. From Table 3, baby boomers and Xs are interested more in a discussion forum and new friends as rewards. Millennials generation seem to be interested in the rewards system. Their overall score is the highest among others. It must be concerned that income money and reputation can attract millennials because their scores start to make a bigger gap with older generations. Besides, Zs are less interested in the rewards system in overall, but they score the highest in term of income money.

The last variable of extrinsic motivation is interpersonal trust as it is about how others use the shared knowledge ethically. Table 3 shows that respondents have no opinion about this variable and choose neutral as their best choice. This variable can be said as a blind spot of knowledge and it is proved by the resulting purpose depends on who owns it. No teacher knows that his/her student will become one of the best scientists in the world and no teacher know that his/her student will become one of the scientists that start biological warfare. Both start with knowledge but end in very different purpose. However, the graph shows the tendency to the right side which means even so little, but people believe and hope that others will use the shared knowledge in an ethical way. Millennials have the highest score and then followed by baby boomers, Xs, and then Zs. It means that millennials trust more to other people. This behavior can affect the shared knowledge. More people have higher interpersonal trust to others, they tend to open their knowledge. On the other hand, lower interpersonal trust means that people tend to limit and select their shared knowledge. It is dangerous since Zs generation shows low interpersonal trust. This situation may lead to limited shared knowledge in the future.

3.2 Qualitative Results

The author has conducted some interviews with Head of Services and Promotion of West Java Education Board, co-founder of Pinisi Edubox, and Manager Knowledge Management System and Operation in Telkom CorpU. The author chose them to get a response from government education and culture department, private learning center, and a company that has implemented a knowledge management system because they were aware of knowledge importance. Their experiences in handling multi-generations for knowledge sharing activity are important to explain quantitative results. Based on the interviews, there are some results that may help to support or explain the quantitative results (see Table 4).

Table 4: Qualitative Interview Results.

Variables	Qualitative Results
Self-efficacy	It is good to take baby boomers and Xs generation as initial content providers but should be helped by younger generations.
Enjoying helping others	West Java Province is well-known about the kind and helpful people. There is no doubt for West Java people to help others. When we share knowledge, knowledge is not be gone, it will be planted more deeply in our life.
Fears	People may have time, but they sometimes do not know what they should share. As long as it is a knowledge sharing platform, it is impossible to misuse the shared knowledge.
Expected reward	It is typical of Indonesian people to choose neutral options, but I believe that the reward program affects much. Money is no doubt a powerful driving force.
Interpersonal trust	It is real in the real world as in a job that someone gets an opportunity because they know something that others don't, so it is normal to keep some information for yourself. I sometimes share important things to my colleagues, but then one of them say it as his own knowledge without saying about me.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We hope you find the information in this template useful in the preparation of your submission. Knowledge sharing activity has run well in a traditional way but hasn't yet developed in a digital way. Knowledge sharing behavior cannot be controlled or enforced as this behavior is essentially voluntary and the sharer has the option of passing on the knowledge that he/she possesses (Davenport and Prusak, 1997).

Intrinsic motivation comes with individual maturity. Baby boomers and Xs are more ready to share their knowledge compared to the younger generations. It happens because of their high self-efficacy variable as the result of life experiences. People can influence an individual's self-efficacy by providing training; role modeling and through positive communications that the goal is achievable (Locke and Latham, 2002). Moreover, their consideration of networking value supports their motivation to help others by sharing their knowledge.

Extrinsic motivation shows an interesting result that the older generation has a problem with time, but the younger has a problem with qualified content. The internal creative team can be developed to answer this situation. It is not easy to push older generations to create contents, but they are very welcome to do some meeting or discuss the session. They feel too old to create contents, especially like videos or pictures. Besides, younger generations can be pushed to package the contents from older generations because they have more creativity. Some younger generations can also become active content providers as he/she experienced in such field like photography, traveling, etc.

Revamp reward and recognition systems are needed to encourage knowledge sharing. The reward is not there by looking at how many contents that have been created, but it depends on the contents' quality. This system can be in the form of the rating scale, share features, reward points that can be exchanged b vouchers or money, paid content, and appreciations.

Interpersonal trust has linked with copyright problem. Respondents give a little positive signal for this variable. Knowledge sharing activity should be promoted in line with the security system. Generation Zs gave the lowest score to this variable. It means that they are not open easily their knowledge to others. They have to change their paradigm in correlation with a competitive environment. It is all about the paradigm. The old paradigm was "knowledge is power". Today, it needs to be explicitly understood that "sharing knowledge is power". Our knowledge is not disappearing when we share it, but it is added, evaluated, and improved to become more comprehensive knowledge.

REFERENCES

Ardichvili, A., Page, V., & Wentling, T. 2003. Motivation and barriers to participation in virtual knowledge-sharing communities of practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 7(1)*, pp. 64- 77.

Bandura, A. 1997. *Self- efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Battelle for Kids. 2018. Managing Five Generations in The Workplace. *AASPA Webinar*.

Cabrera & Cabrera. 2002. Knowledge- sharing dilemmas. *Organization Studies, 23(5)*, pp. 687- 710.

Chow, W. S. & Chan, L.S. 2008. The social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information & Management, 45(7)*, pp.458- 65.

Chennamaneni, A., Teng, J. T., & Raja, M. 2012. A unified model of knowledge sharing behaviours: theoretical development and empirical test. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 31 (11)*, pp. 1097- 115.

DailySocial.id. 2017. MOOC in Indonesia Survey 2017. Indonesia: DailySocial.id.

Davenport, T. H. & Prusak, L. 1998. *Working Knowledge*. Boston, Mass, Harvard Business School

Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R.M. 2000. The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11(4)*, pp. 227- 68.

Gefen, D., Karahanna, E., & Straub, D.W. 2003. Trust and TAM in online shopping: An integrated model. *Mis Quarterly, 27(1)*, pp. 51- 90.

Hau, Y. S., Kim, B., Lee, H., & Kim, Y.- G. 2013. The effects of individual motivations and social capital on employees' tacit and explicit knowledge sharing intentions. *International Journal of Information Management, 33(2)*, pp. 356- 66.

Hsu, M.- H., Ju, T.L., Yen, C.- H. & Chang, C.- M. 2007. Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self- efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human- Computer Studies, 65(2)*, pp. 153- 69.

Hung, S.- Y., Lai, H.- M., & Chang, W.- W. 2011. Knowledge- sharing motivations affecting R&D employees' acceptance of electronic knowledge repository. *Behaviour & Information Technology, 30(2)*, pp. 213- 30.

Jeon, S., Kim, Y.- G., & Koh, J. 2011. An integrative model for knowledge sharing in communities- of-practice. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 15(2)*, pp. 251- 69.

King, W.R. & Marks, P.V. 2008. Motivating knowledge sharing through a knowledge management system. *Omega, 36(1)*, pp. 131- 46.

Lin, H. F. 2007. Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower, 28(3/4)*, pp. 315-332.

Locke, E. A. & Latham, G. P. 2002. Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist, 57 (9)*, pp. 705-717.

Ma, W. W. & Chan, A. 2014. Knowledge sharing and social media: Altruism, perceived online attachment motivation, and perceived online relationship commitment. *Computers in Human Behavior, 39*, pp. 51- 58.

Matschke, C., Moskaliuk, J., Bokhorst, F., Schümmer, T. & Cress, U. 2014. Motivational factors of information exchange in social information spaces. *Computers in Human Behavior, 36(0),* pp. 549- 58.

Razmerita, L., Kirchner, K., and Nabeth, T. 2014. Social Media In Organizations: Leveraging Personal And Collective Knowledge Processes. *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 24(1)*, pp. 74- 93.

Razmerita, L., Kirchner, K., & Nielsen, P. 2016. What Factors Influence Knowledge Sharing in Organizations?: A Social Dilemma Perspective of Social Media Communication. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 20(6)*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2016-0112 Šajeva, S. 2007. An Investigation of Critical Barriers to Effective Knowledge Management. *Social Sciences/ Socialiniai Mokslai, 58(4)*, pp. 20- 27.

Upasana, KM. 2014. A comparative study of traditional education & e.education with special reference to India. *International Journal of Research in Business Management, 2(5)*, pp. 149-162.

Van Acker, F., Vermeulen, M., Kreijns, K., Lutgerink, J., &van Buuren, H. 2014. The role of knowledge sharing self- efficacy in sharing Open Educational Resources. *Computers in Human Behavior, 39*, pp. 136- 44.

Wang, W.- T. & Hou, Y.- P. 2015. Motivations of employees' knowledge sharing behaviors: A self- determination perspective. *Information and Organization, 25(1)*, pp. 1- 26.

Wasko, M. M. & Faraj, S. 2005. Why Should I Share? Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice. *Mis Quarterly, 29(1)*, pp. 35- 57.

World Economic Forum. 2018. *The Global Competitiveness Report*. Retrieved December 16, 2018, from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/GCR2017-2018/ 05FullReport/TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2017 %E2%80%932018. Pdf

APPENDIX

Table 5: List of Questions.

No.	Questions
Q.01	I am confident in my ability to produce knowledge that is useful to others
Q.02	I have enough experience and expertise to produce knowledge that is useful to others.
Q.03	I am sure that I can respond to or answer the questions that other people ask about the knowledge I share
Q.04	Many other people can provide more valuable and useful knowledge than what I share
Q.05	I am happy if I can share my knowledge
Q.06	I like to help others by sharing the knowledge that I have
Q.07	I feel that sharing knowledge with others is a good thing.
Q.08	I can not take my time to share knowledge
Q.09	There will be no impact on others when I share the knowledge I have
Q.10	I want to share knowledge because I can get new friends
Q.11	I want to share knowledge because I can build my reputation and fame.
Q.12	I want to share knowledge because I can get income money
Q.13	I want to share knowledge because I can easily discuss with others.
Q.14	I believe that people who access my shared knowledge are trustworthy people
Q.15	I believe that people who access my shared knowledge will not misuse the knowledge
Q.16	I believe that people who access my shared knowledge will not take unethical advantage of it