



KNOWLEDGE SHARING PRACTICES AMONGST COLLEGE STUDENTS IN RELATION WITH AREA OF LIVING

Shatarupa Burman ¹ | Dr. Debasri Banerjee ²

¹SRF Ph.D Scholar, Department Of Education, University Of Calcutta

²Professor, Department Of Education, University Of Calcutta

Abstract: The quantity and quality of our knowledge has evolved over time leading to knowledge explosion. Knowledge sharing takes place when knowledge is shared by individuals within a group and during the process the knowledge will also be negotiated and refined until it becomes common knowledge to the group. This paper aims to explore if a difference existed in knowledge sharing practices amongst 520 urban and non-urban govt. and govt. aided college students of West Bengal. To measure the Knowledge Sharing Practices amongst college student, a self-developed test (K.S.P scale) has been used by the researcher. To accomplish objective, Mann Whitney U test were conducted on the scores of Knowledge Sharing Practice across area of living. This study concluded there are significant differences in earning reputation by sharing knowledge, in earning rewards by sharing knowledge, in actual knowledge sharing behaviour, in content of shared knowledge and knowledge sharing total due to area of living, non-urban students share more knowledge for reputation and rewards than urban students. Non-urban college students share more contents than the urban students. Finally knowledge sharing practices amongst non-urban college students are higher than the urban students.

Key words: Knowledge sharing, Urban and Non-urban college students.

I. Introduction:

The quantity and quality of our knowledge has evolved over time leading to knowledge explosion. Knowledge sharing takes place when knowledge is shared by individuals within a group and during the process the knowledge will also be negotiated and refined until it becomes common knowledge to the group (Yang, 2004). Knowledge sharing among student has been recognized as an important and interesting area of study in the academic world.

Knowledge sharing has been studied in different ways. Some studies are qualitative in nature, some are quantitative. Some thematic analyses have also been found. Various studies have tried to identify the factors that affect knowledge sharing practices. According to Brouwer and Jansen (2019), Haq & Haq (2018), Moghavemi and Sarabati (2016) trust is highly significant predictor of knowledge sharing. Ahmed and Karim (2019) in their thematic analysis found knowledge sharing outcomes at three levels – the individual, team and organisation. In another study Shaffiyans and Moazen (2013) have found student's decision making to share their knowledge was dependent to peers knowledge sharing practices. According to Brouwer and Jansen (2019), Moghavemi and Sarabati (2016) perceived reciprocal benefit is a strong predictor of knowledge sharing which affect student's academic performance and recognition. Brouwer and Jansen (2019) have also found altruism has significant relation with K.S.P. Haq & Haq (2018), Waangpitwong (2015) in their study cited ICT use is key factor in order to boost knowledge sharing practice among students. They concluded ICT use is highly significant predictor of knowledge sharing. Waangpitwong (2015) in his study found degree of competition, instructors supports are the main factors affecting Knowledge Sharing whereas Mallasi and Ainin (2015), Wei,

Chew and Yen (2012) in their study found self efficacy and students' willingness are the main factors affecting Knowledge Sharing.

With the increasing emphasis on collaborative work in colleges, organisations, universities have been structuring its curriculum to engage students in collaborative learning which allows them to reflect and learn more effectively. In this context the understanding of knowledge sharing may help to develop various educational practices in the educational institutions through curricular and co-curricular activities which can lead to knowledge sharing. Thus it is easy to understand why knowledge sharing among students continues to be an enduring research issue.

II. Objective:

The objective of this study is to explore if a difference existed in knowledge sharing practices amongst urban and non-urban college students.

To accomplish objective, Mann Whitney U test were conducted on the scores of Knowledge Sharing Practice across area of living. Null hypotheses were framed to find if any significant differences existed in knowledge sharing practices and its dimensions amongst college student across area of living.

III. Hypothesis:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in Knowledge sharing practices (K.S_TOTAL) due to area of living.

H_{01a}: There is no significant difference in enjoyment in helping others (K.S_EHO) due to area of living.

H_{01b}: There is no significant difference in reputation (K.S_REP) due to area of living.

H_{01c}: There is no significant difference in rewards (K.S_REWARDS) due to area of living.

H_{01d}: There is no significant difference in attitudes towards knowledge sharing (K.S_A.T.S) due to area of living.

H_{01e}: There is no significant difference in intention to share knowledge (K.S_I.S.K) due to area of living.

H_{01f}: There is no significant difference in actual knowledge sharing behaviour (K.S_A.K.S.B.P) due to area of living.

H_{01g}: There is no significant difference in content of shared knowledge (K.S_C.S) due to area of living.

H_{01h}: There is no significant difference in preferred channels (K.S_P.C) due to area of living.

H_{0i}: There is no significant difference in barriers of knowledge sharing (K.S_B.K.S) due to area of living.

IV. Operational Definitions

Knowledge sharing: knowledge sharing refers to sharing of mutual knowledge, beliefs and assumptions. Knowledge sharing is an activity through which knowledge namely information, skills or expertise is exchanged among people, friends, families, communities. The operational definitions of nine sub-dimensions of knowledge sharing practice (K.S.P) scale are as follows:

- **Enjoyment in helping others (K.S_EHO):** knowledge sharing gives a feeling of enjoyment by the ability to be of help to some individual. Knowledge sharing due to intrinsic motivation.
- **Reputation (K.S_REP):** When the sharing of knowledge leads to popularity and gaining of fame or reputation. Knowledge sharing due to extrinsic motivation.
- **Rewards (K.S_REWARDS):** In this segment researcher wants to know whether students are getting rewards for sharing knowledge with their peers or not.
- **Attitude towards sharing (K.S_A.T.S):** Researcher wants to find whether students are sharing knowledge for the sake of duty or do they value sharing as a morality.

- **Intentions to share knowledge (K.S_I.S.K):** In this segment researcher aims at finding the intention behind knowledge sharing amongst students.
- **Actual knowledge sharing behaviour practiced (K.S_A.K.S.B.P):** In this segment researcher want to find the behaviour of students while sharing knowledge.
- **Content shared (K.S_C.S):** Researcher wants to find the content shared by students.
- **Modes of knowledge sharing (K.S_P.C):** researcher aims at finding the preferred modes of knowledge sharing amongst students.
- **Barriers to knowledge sharing (K.S_B.K.S):** Researcher wants to know what are the hindrances faced by students while sharing knowledge.

College student: Full time student attending undergraduate course from a general degree college affiliated under university.

Area of living: Habitable area of dwelling. Mainly divided into two groups i.e Urban (characteristic of a city) and Non-urban (area other than urban) group.

Population:

All under graduate students from government and government aided colleges under the affiliation of govt. aided universities of West Bengal are the total research population.

V. Sampling Technique and sample:

As the data was collected during the pandemic period, incidental sampling technique has been used for this study. Each subject was offered a Google form questionnaire including directions for completing the questionnaire and a general information schedule. The subjects were assured for the anonymity and confidentiality of their responses. A total of 520 subjects responded and their responses were recorded through Google form.

VI. Tools:

General Information Schedule (GIS)

Participants were asked to indicate their sex, age, location of college, area of living, etc. for this study.

Tool to measure Knowledge Sharing Practices:

To measure the Knowledge Sharing Practices amongst college student, a self-developed test(K.S.P scale) has been used by the researcher. To find out the internal consistency of the scale the Cronbach Alpha method was used. The result is represented in the following table.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics of K.S.P scale

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.749	.720	26

VII. Result and Findings:

After collecting data by utilizing SPSS, Mann Whitney u test were performed to compare each of the K.S.P and their sub-dimensions in relation to area of living (Urban, Non-urban).

Table 2: Non-parametric test showing the difference in knowledge sharing practices amongst college student across area of living

Sub-dimension	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
K.S_EHO (Enjoyment in helping others)	30752.500	52697.500	-1.601	.109
K.S_REP (Reputation)	26872.500	48817.500	-3.510	.000
K.S_REWARDS (Rewards)	28622.000	50567.000	-3.793	.000
K.S_A.T.S (Attitude towards sharing)	31702.000	53647.000	-.554	.580
K.S_I.S.K (Intention to share knowledge)	30220.500	52165.500	-1.472	.141
K.S_A.K.S.B.P (actual knowledge sharing behaviour practiced)	27397.000	49342.000	-3.169	.002
K.S_C.S (Content shared)	25335.500	47280.500	-4.330	.000
K.S_P.C (Preferred channels)	31943.500	53888.500	-.344	.731
K.S_B.K.S (Barriers of knowledge sharing)	29931.500	51876.500	-1.759	.079
K.S_TOTAL	24694.500	46639.500	-4.659	.000

a. Grouping Variable: **_ area of living**

The significance level is .01.

Independent samples Mann Whitney Test was performed to determine if a difference existed amongst K.S and it's subscales due to area of living. From table 2 it can be stated that **there are significant differences in knowledge sharing practices (p=.000), in earning reputation by sharing knowledge (p=.000), in earning rewards by sharing knowledge (p=.000), in actual knowledge sharing behaviour (p=.002), in content of shared knowledge and knowledge sharing (p=.000), due to area of living.** Thus H_{01} , H_{01b} , H_{01c} , H_{01f} , H_{01g} have been rejected at 0.01 significance level.

Table 3: Rank table showing the difference in knowledge sharing practices amongst college student across area of living

	AOL	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
K.S_EHO	1	209	252.14	52697.50
	2	311	266.12	82762.50
K.S_REP	1	209	233.58	48817.50
	2	311	278.59	86642.50
K.S_REWARDS	1	209	241.95	50567.00
	2	311	272.97	84893.00
K.S_A.T.S	1	209	256.68	53647.00
	2	311	263.06	81813.00
K.S_I.S.K	1	209	249.60	52165.50
	2	311	267.83	83294.50
K.S_A.K.S.B.P	1	209	236.09	49342.00
	2	311	276.91	86118.00
K.S_C.S	1	209	226.22	47280.50
	2	311	283.54	88179.50
K.S_P.C	1	209	257.84	53888.50
	2	311	262.29	81571.50
K.S_B.K.S_TOT	1	209	248.21	51876.50

	2	311	268.76	83583.50
K.S_TOT	1	209	223.16	46639.50
	2	311	285.60	88820.50
	Total	520		

1-Urban, 2- Non-urban

From rank table it can be stated that non-urban students share more knowledge for reputation and rewards than urban students. Therefore non-urban college students share more contents than the urban students. Finally knowledge sharing practices amongst non-urban college students are higher than the urban students.

VIII. Conclusion:

No previous research has been found on knowledge sharing in relation to area of living. This study concluded there are significant differences in earning reputation by sharing knowledge, in earning rewards by sharing knowledge, in actual knowledge sharing behavior, in content of shared knowledge and knowledge sharing total due to area of living, non-urban students share more knowledge for reputation and rewards than urban students. Non-urban college students share more contents than the urban students. Finally knowledge sharing practices amongst non-urban college students are higher than the urban students.

IX. Limitations of the Study:

In this study the researcher employed only quantitative survey technique. It would have been better if the researcher employed both quantitative and qualitative survey technique to study the research problem in depth.

X. Suggestions for Further Study:

In the light of the research and findings drawn from the study, following suggestions are made for further research in the field.

1. This study can also be extended on the students of different academic levels such as post graduation students etc.
2. The similar study can be conducted on different streams of students. i.e medical students, engineering students etc.

There are vast areas in this field which have remained unexplored so far and any attempt to make to develop in them may be both regarding and instructive.

XI. Reference:

- Ahamed, F., & Karim, M. (2019 april). Impact Of Knowledge Sharing : A Review and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Workplace Learning* .
- Ainin, H. M. (2015). Investigating Knowledge Sharing behaviour in academic environment. *journal of organisational knowledge management* , 2015.
- Argote.L, I. (2000). Knowlegde transfer: A Basis for Competitive Advantage in Firms. *Organisational behaviour and human decision process* , 82 (1), 150-169.
- Brouwer, J., & Jensen, E. (2019). Beyond Grades : Developing Knowledge Sharing in Learning Communities as a Graduate Attribute. *Higher Education Research and Development* .
- C.C.WEI, C. (2012). Knowledge Sharing Patterns of U.G Students. *Library Review* , 61 (5), 327-344.
- Cabrera, A. C. (2002). Knowledge sharing dilemmas. *Organisation Studies* , 23 (5), 687-710.
- Ghedirian, H. A. (2014). Knowledge sharing behaviour among students in learning environment:A review of literature. *Asian Social Science* , 10 (4).

- Haq, M.N. (2018). Investigating the knowledge Sharing among Students in Pakistan. *European online Journal of Natural and Social Science* , 7 (1(s)).
- Mahamood J., H. M. (2016) Review on knowledge sharing behaviour studies: Theories and Research Approaches . *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* , 9 (34), 1-8.
- Majid S. P. Role of Knowledge Sharing in the Learning Process. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal* , 2 (1).
- Millar, D. J. (1996). The resource based view of the firm in two environments. *The Academy of Management Journal* , 39 (5), 519-543.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organisational knowledge creation. *Organisation Science* , 5 (1), 14-37.
- Nonaka.I. (2009). Tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion:Controvercy and advancement in organisational knowledge creation theory. *Organisation Science* , 20 (3), 635-652.
- Prusak, L. T. (2000). Working Knowledge: How organisation manage what they know.
- Shaffciyans, A. M. (2013). Enhancing Knowledge Sharing among Higher Education Students through Digital Gme. *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology* , III (3).
- Wongpioatwog. (2015)Factors Influencing Knowledge Shaing among University Students. *Asia Pacific Society for Computers in Education*. Hongkong.
- Sharabati, S. A. (2016). effect of trust and perceived reciprocal benefit on students' knowledge sharing via facebook and academic performance. *the electronic journal of knoledge management* , 23-35.
- Snowden, D. (2002). Complex acts of knowing:Paradox and Descriptive self awareness. *Journal of Knowledge Management* , 6 (2), 100-111.
- V.C.Keong, S. S. (2015). The Role of Knowledge Sharing in the Learning Process among Iraq EFL post Grduate Students in UKM. *International Journal of Education and Research* , 3 (12).