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Abstract

More than billions of people are networked and connected together to create, collaborate and contribute their knowledge. The new world of collaboration and communication has been created by online social networks. Hence, growth and popularity of social collaboration is continuously increasing day-by-day. In spite of the importance of social networks, there is comparatively little theory-driven empirical research that has been published to address this new type of communication and interaction phenomena. In this research, we explore the factors which motivate people to participate actively in social collaboration. We conceptualized that use of social collaboration is an intentional social action where people willing to share their knowledge, experience and expertise. We examine the relative impact of We-Intention, moral trust and self-motivation to participate in social collaboration and knowledge sharing activity. An empirical study of social collaborators has been done and we concluded that knowledge sharing is an important goal to participate in social collaboration.

1. Introduction

Every individual (and every organization) has links to others. Individuals are linked to some people by virtue of kinship. Individuals are linked to other people through their place of work. There are two distinct types of physically existing networks, namely formal and informal social networks. While formal social networks are mostly conceptualized in an organizational context, informal social networks are mostly studied in the context of interaction among individuals with respect to friendship, common interests, or health issues etc. There may or may not be overlap between these two networks. Other common places where individuals are linked to one another are schools, places of religious worship, and places where individuals volunteer.

Social networking websites are virtual communities that allow people to connect and interact online with each other on a particular subject [1]. Membership in online social networks has recently exploded at an exponential rate. Hitwise [2] announced that the market share of the top 20 social networking websites grew by 11.5 percent from January 2007 to February 2007 and activity in social network website accounted for 6.5 percent of all Internet traffic in February 2007. The objective of online social networks is social interactions and connection, it is more appropriate to consider the use of online social networks as collective social action [3-5]. As this phenomenon is quite new, there exists relatively little theory-driven empirical research on intentional social actions within online social networks. In this study, we aim at developing and empirically validating a research model on knowledge sharing social action in online social networks.

2. Literature Review

Social collaboration can help an organization break down its silos and share its explicit knowledge by providing an open platform and environment that fosters interaction amongst people. The social capabilities combined platforms make it easier than ever to share information through groups and newsfeeds, ask questions and find answers in communities, and locate experts based on the content they create. Social collaboration takes the effort out of making knowledge and people discoverable. Social collaboration enables people to stay up-to-date on information that they care about, get to know each other, share important information, and connect to organizational systems and services. Just as someone can follow a person, they can follow a system and receive updates about its status and activities. Social connections break down silos and enable connections in an organization so that regardless of location or device, people can spend more time working and being productive.

Throughout the world, we’re seeing value creation and consumption shifting from individuals to the collective, organizing structures moving from closed hierarchies to open networks, task coordination evolving from top down to bottom up, and knowledge transfer shifting from a linear distribution to dynamic participation. In this new world of social collaboration, organizations are re-examining how they operate and are seeking ways to capitalize on the new efficiencies of agility and robustness. These efficiencies can be gained...
by sharing knowledge, working together, accelerating learning, and providing a connected experience that empowers groups of people to get things done.

**We-Intention**

According to Bagozzi and Lee [6], there are three levels of explanation on decision making in social research. The three levels of explanation are: (1) Classic individual based models (A personal intention to perform an individual act by oneself), (2) Contingency consistency and other normative based models (A personal intention to perform an individual act but with consideration of the social influence), and (3) A group-based model (including both I-intention and we-intention to perform a group act). In the past two decades, research in Information Systems (IS) has been dominated by the classic individual based models to explain the adoption and initial use of new technology [7]. Basically, an individual’s personal intention to use a new technology depends on his or her individual reasons and perceived social pressure for using this technology.

We-Intention is defined as a “Commitment of an individual to participate in a group to perform group act in which the participants perceive themselves as members of the group” [8]. The concept was introduced by a number of philosophers [8, 9], and was expressed in terms of “We together will perform X (X represents a joint action)”. While I-intention is explained by individual-level reasons for performing a personal act, We-Intention is explained when a person view the self as part of a social representation in performing a group act [6]. We-Intention exists when a person believes not only that he can perform his part of their joint action, but also that he together with his colleague participants can perform the action jointly at least with some nonzero probability [10]. In comparison with I-intention, We-Intention highlights the individual commitment in collectivity and the social nature of group action. Therefore, We-Intention is a more appropriate approach to study online social activities.

**Moral Trust**

Moral trust refers to moral character of collaborators, by which a given situation person is honest, loyal, fair and take care of peer’s reputation by avoiding sloppy or fraudulent collaborative work [11-14]. This suggests that trust with each other can be formed on the basis of evidence of their colleagues’ moral character. The moral trust can be explained like this: evidence that a potential member A is honest, loyal, fair, and/or cares about his/her peers can provide a member B with reason to trust A to avoid damaging B’s reputation with sloppy or fraudulent collaborative work. Similarly, evidence of A’s good moral character can give B reason to share ideas or materials with A; evidence that A cares about fairness and abhors exploiting people’s vulnerabilities can rationalize B’s expectation that A will not steal B’s ideas or use B’s reagents to scoop B.

Some authors distinguish moral trust (which they call simply ‘trust’) from mere reliance. While there is debate about the right way to define this distinction, some points are clear. In contrast to interactions of mere reliance, moral trusting relationships carry moral weight, because they possess the possibility of betrayal [15]. As Holton [16] notes, in moral trust the trustor counts on the trusted’s intrinsic moral motivations, whereas self-interested fear of external punishments is insufficiently internal to be the basis of moral trust.

The term ‘trust’ broadly to refer to any cognitive attitude of taking the proposition that someone will do something (or care for some good) as a premise in one’s practical reasoning. Thus, the phenomenon to be explained is trust between social collaborators: members of the community making plans based on the assumption that a fellow member will do something or care for some valued good. The self-interest and moral trust explanations provide different explanations of this phenomenon. For the self-interest approach, trust is a matter of mere reliance on the self-interest of one’s colleagues. For the moral trust approach, trust is a matter of moral trust in the moral motivations of one’s colleagues.

**Self-Motivation**

Self-Motivation can be defined as the ability to share or acquire knowledge because of one’s own enthusiasm or interest, without needing pressure from others. It is a group of phenomena that affects the nature of an individual's behavior, the strength of the behavior, and the persistence of the behavior. There are many approaches to self-motivation for social collaboration: physiological, behavioral, cognitive, and social. Knowledge contribution in an electronic network of practice primarily occurs when individuals are motivated to access the network, review the questions posted, choose those they are able and willing to answer, and take the time and effort to formulate and post a response.

Wasko and Faraj [17] explained how individual motivation of knowledge sharing in an electronic network of practice mainly occurs when individuals are motivated to access the network. Self-motivation for social collaboration is driven by an interest or enjoyment in knowledge sharing task itself, and exists with the individual rather than relying on any external pressure. In order to extend knowledge sharing, individuals must think that their contribution to others will be worth the effort and that some new value will be created, with expectations of receiving some of that
value for themselves [18]. These personal benefits are more likely to accumulate to individuals who actively participate and help others [19]. Thus, the expectation of personal benefits can motivate individuals to share their knowledge to others in the absence of personal acquaintance, similarity, or the likelihood of direct reciprocity [20].

Kankanahalli et al. [21] explained that self-efficacy relates to the perception of people about what they can do with the skills they have. When people share expertise with the group members, they gain confidence in terms of what they can do and this brings the benefit of increased self-efficacy. Knowledge self-efficacy is typically presented in the form of people believing that their knowledge can help solve job-related problems, improve work efficiency, or make a difference to their organization.

**Participation in Social Collaboration**

Electronic networks are computer mediated discussion forums focused on problems of practice that enable individuals to exchange advice and ideas with others based on common interests. Social Collaboration, social networking or Web 2.0 is a grass roots movement within the society. The very notion of social network implies that linked individuals interact repeatedly with each other. This notion allows them not only to learn successful strategies and adapt to them, but also to condition their own behavior on the behavior of others, in a strategic forward looking manner. The social network influences and constrains in nontrivial ways the behavior of individuals [22] but also contributes to aspects generically referred to as social capital [23, 24], which favor the emergence of coordinated actions.

Participation in social collaboration also puts people at the center of computing and ensures that employees, partners, and customers can connect with the right people and information. Most of the existing literature shed’s light onto the role of ties in all types of social networks, such as individual [25], intra-organizational [26], or inter-organizational networks [27-29].

Sharing and participating are vitally important for any enterprise that wants to maintain its collective memory. Participation must be simple and rewarding, with embedded social gestures that ebb and flow throughout the systems that people use every day. Social collaboration should be more than just a place where one goes to be social; it should be part of the daily working environment. By providing insightful awareness, gratifying participation, and preserving communal knowledge, social collaboration helps individuals enhance their experience and enables to create an embedded culture of sharing. When social collaboration is deeply embedded in services and applications, the line between consuming and creating blurs, and share becomes the new save.

**Knowledge Sharing**

Knowledge sharing for collaborative work has already been established in past studies [30, 31]. Storck [32] suggest that knowledge sharing is important to build trust and improving the effectiveness of group work. However, achieving an effective knowledge sharing process may encounter certain challenges, in particular when teams are faced with cultural, geographical and time zone differences [33, 34]. Faraj & Sproull [35] suggested that instead of sharing specialized knowledge, individuals should focus on knowing where expertise is located and needed. Such an approach towards knowledge sharing is known as transactive memory. Transactive memory is defined as the set of knowledge possessed by group members coupled with an awareness of who knows what [36]. It has been appealed that the transactive memory may positively affect group performance and collaboration by quickly bringing the needed expertise to knowledge seekers [32, 37]. Another socially constructed concept is connecting mechanism between individuals and a team for collective knowledge. Grant [38] argue that collective knowledge comprises elements of knowledge that are common to all members of an organization.

Collective knowledge is defined as ‘a knowledge of the unspoken, of the invisible structure of a situation, certain wisdom’ [39]. Such a concept may entail the profound knowledge of an environment, of established rules, laws and regulations. It may include language, other forms of symbolic communication and shared meaning [38]. Building a sense of collective knowledge in co-located organizations would mean the development of a collective mind [40] through participation in tasks and social rituals [39, 41].

3. **Research Model, Hypothesis and Measurement Items**

**Research Model**

We develop research model which is based on motivational factors (We-Intention, Moral Trust and Self-Motivation) which encourage people to participate on social collaboration. The social collaboration is a mediator between motivational factor and outcome variables (knowledge sharing). All to gather, this proposed model makes possible accelerate knowledge sharing activity through online social collaboration.

**Hypothesis**

Knowledge has long been recognized as an important resource for organizational growth and sustained
competitive advantage, especially for organizations competing in uncertain environments [42]. Recently, some authors have argued that knowledge is an organization’s most important resource because it is intangible assets and creative processes that are hard to reproduce [38]. However, most organizations do not have all the required knowledge within their official boundaries and must depend on individual’s linkages to outside to acquire knowledge [43]. Organizational members are benefited from external network connections because they may gain access to new information, expertise, and ideas not available locally, and can interact informally, free from the constraints of hierarchy and local rules.

**Motivational Factor**

*We-Intention*

We-Intention is assumed to capture the motivational factor that influences a behavior [44]. We-Intention focuses on the presence of “we” together in making an intention that we will continue to use an online social networking site in the future. This is a joint intention made by a group of people that everyone will perform his/her own part (individual intention of joining and using online social networks continually) to perform a joint action together with others (continue to use online social networks together).

**H1a**: The greater the we-intention in group the greater the positive effect on moral trust for knowledge sharing.

**H1b**: The greater the we-intention in group the greater the positive effect on self-motivation for knowledge sharing.

**H1c**: The greater the we-intention in group the greater the positive effect on participation in social collaboration for knowledge sharing.

**Moral Trust**

Trust is a very rich theme that has been studied by philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, computer scientists, and scholars from many other fields. Some of them see trust as a way to deal with risks and uncertainties, others as the willingness to be vulnerable. Still, many scholars underline the importance of trust for the well-being of individuals and society. Trust in the moral character of individuals provided such reasons for trust. Rather than placing people under strict control mechanisms, a group sought members who would ‘consider that they are on their honor’ to use their time well [45]. In describing the ideal group members included moral virtues: for example, one list includes ‘honesty, accuracy, dependability, loyalty and cooperativeness’ [45]. However, moral trust is not just a belief. It is also a behavioral disposition that is somewhat independent of belief. We may thus speak of two kinds of trust. The first believes something about others. The second is behaving as if you believed this. Trust, norms, and identification can be considered as social capital since they are organizational resources or assets rooted within social relationships that can improve the efficiency of coordinated action.

**H2**: The greater the moral trust for knowledge sharing the greater the positive effect on social collaboration.

**Self-Motivation**

Self-Motivation for social collaboration has been highlighted as a benefit for individuals to engage in social exchange [46]. When people share knowledge to social networking site, they may gain self-confidence in terms of what they can do and this brings the benefit of increased self-efficacy [47]. This belief can serve as a self-motivational force for knowledge contributors to contribute knowledge [48]. Knowledge self-efficacy is typically expressed in the form of people believing that their knowledge can help to solve job-related problems [20], improve work efficiency [49], or make a difference to their group [50]. On the other hand, if people feel that they lack knowledge that is useful to social collaboration, they may decline from contributing knowledge because they believe that their contribution cannot make a positive impact in that group. Prior research suggests that people who share knowledge in online communities believe in reciprocity [50]. Reciprocity is a motivational mechanism for people to contribute to open databases [51]. It can act as a benefit
for knowledge contributors because they expect future help from others in lieu of their contributions [51]. Further, researchers have observed that people who regularly helped others in virtual communities seemed to receive help more quickly when they asked for it [52].

**H3:** The greater the self-motivation for knowledge sharing the greater the positive effect on social collaboration.

**Knowledge sharing through participation in social collaboration**

When individuals have a common practice of social collaboration, knowledge readily flows across that practice, allowing individuals to create social networks and support knowledge exchange [55]. They suggest that there are two types of practice-related social networks that are essential for understanding learning, work, and the movement of knowledge: (1) communities of practice and (2) networks of practice. A community of practice involves a tightly knit group of members engaged in a shared practice who know each other and work together, typically meet face-to-face, and continually negotiate, communicate, and coordinate with each other directly. In networks of practice, it neither consist of a larger, loosely knit, geographically distributed group of individuals engaged in a shared practice, but also may not know each other nor necessarily expect to meet face-to-face [56]. However, the participation in social collaboration is open and voluntary and they are typically strangers. Knowledge seekers have no control over who responds to their questions or the quality of the responses. Knowledge contributors have no assurances that those they are helping will ever return the favor, and lurkers may draw upon the knowledge of others without contributing anything in return.

**H4:** The greater the participation in social collaboration the greater the positive effect on knowledge sharing.

### Table 1. Measurement Variable, Definition and Related Prior Researcher’s Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We-Intention</td>
<td>Commitment of an individual to participate in a group to perform group act in which the participants perceive themselves as members of the group.</td>
<td>[6, 8, 9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Trust</td>
<td>Moral trust refers to moral character of collaborators, by which a given situation person is honest, loyal, fair and take care of peer’s reputation by avoiding sloppy or fraudulent collaborative work.</td>
<td>[11-14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td>Ability to share or acquired knowledge because of one’s own enthusiasm or interest, without needing pressure from others.</td>
<td>[17, 21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Social Collaboration</td>
<td>A process that helps multiple people interact and sharing culture, knowledge, working together, accelerating learning and providing a connected experience that empowers groups of people to achieve common goal.</td>
<td>[22-24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing is an activity by which information, skills, expertise and experience is shared among the people or community.</td>
<td>[53, 54]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We used a five-point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) to evaluate responses to questions concerning motivational factor, social collaboration and knowledge sharing activity at social networks. To test empirically the proposed research model, we simultaneously conducted paper-based surveys from social collaborators. We collected 250 responses from Kathmandu University, Tribhuvan University and Pokhara University in Nepal, among them 11 samples were not taking into consideration because of uncompleted responses. Our target was in the people who were enthusiastically participating, commenting and posting questions in social networking sites. The research model and variable presented were tested and verified by SPSS 20.

Majority of respondents who are actively participate in social collaboration fall under age group of 40-49 years (41.8%) and have academic qualification on master’s degree (48.5%). By profession, 40.6% respondents fall under academics and 62.8% are involved in social collaboration for the time period of more than 5 years. 55.2% respondents use social collaboration site every day and 36.8 % believe that they are using social collaboration site for knowledge sharing. Details of demographic data are presented on **Table 2**. Five multiple-items constructs were subjected to multiple regression analysis. The validity of the constructs was evaluated in terms of uni-dimensionality, convergent validity, internal consistency, and discriminant validity. We were conducting an
exploratory factor analysis. All factor loadings were significant at p<0.01. In order to assess the reliability and convergent validity of our model, we have checked Cronbach’s α, squared multiple correlations (SMC), and construct reliability and AVE values. Cronbach’s α estimates the proportion of the variance in the test score that can be attributed to true score variance. It is used to estimate the proportion to variance that is systematic or consistent in a set of a score. The value for each construct is more than 0.800, which implies that items have a relatively high consistency [57]. The Cronbach’s α value for the presented constructs range from 0.803 to 0.907, which is highly consistent within the constructs. All the AVE values were greater than the 0.5 cutoff point indicating satisfactory convergence validity. Discriminant validity was assessed with Chain’s

Table 2. Demographic descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>14 (5.9%)</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>71 (29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>57 (23.8%)</td>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>97 (40.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>100 (41.8%)</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>53 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>41 (17.2%)</td>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>18 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 60</td>
<td>27 (11.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in social collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>14 (5.9%)</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>69 (28.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>75 (31.4%)</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>116 (48.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>150 (62.8%)</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>54 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of using social collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>132 (55.2%)</td>
<td>Posting questions</td>
<td>25 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice in a week</td>
<td>21 (8.8%)</td>
<td>Posting answers</td>
<td>34 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a week</td>
<td>57 (23.8%)</td>
<td>Seeking knowledge</td>
<td>32 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in a month</td>
<td>29 (12.2%)</td>
<td>Knowledge contribution</td>
<td>88 (36.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience sharing</td>
<td>35 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check for friends update</td>
<td>25 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Result of measurement model assessment and constructs correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Construct reliability</th>
<th>SMC</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Constructs correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.795*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.772 .799*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.712 .722 .812*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.633 .641 .742 .821*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.628 .638 .667 .750 .826*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WI = We-Intention, MT = Moral Trust, SM = Self-Motivation, PSC = Participation in Social Collaboration, KS = knowledge Sharing, * = √AVE and all values were significant at p<0.01.

Table 4. Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI2</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI1</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI4</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI3</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT1</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT4</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT2</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT3</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM3</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM1</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM4</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.511</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5. Summary of Hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path/ Hypothesis</th>
<th>SPC</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a: We Intention ➔ Moral Trust</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: We Intention ➔ Participation in Social Collaboration</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: We Intention ➔ Self-Motivation</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Moral Trust ➔ Participation in Social Collaboration</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Self-Motivation ➔ Participation in Social Collaboration</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Participation in Social Collaboration ➔ Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the values were significant at p<0.01.

methods [58]. The square root AVE for each constructs was greater than the correlation of the construct with any other constructs; thus the measurement model evidenced discriminant validity. All the above stated values are presented on Table 3 were significance at 0.01 level.

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis to evaluate the measurement model [59]. Table 4 presents the data of the rotated factor matrix. This matrix is used to compute the rotated factor matrix from the original (unrotated) factor matrix. The factor transformation matrix describes the specific rotation applied to the factor solution for the proposed model. The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy is .870, which is meritorious.

Figure 2 and Table 5 show the results of path coefficients of the proposed model. All the values were significant at 0.01 level. The standard path coefficient for participation in social collaboration from we-intention, moral trust and self-motivation were 0.52, 0.67 and 0.75 respectively. Our data showed that majority of people involving in social collaboration have main intention to share their knowledge. The standard path coefficient for participation in social collaboration to knowledge sharing was 0.58. The knowledge sharing may play important role in determining a group’s creativity relevant process and outcome in social collaboration network. These factors include ability of group member to identify each other contributions.

5. Conclusions and Discussions

The main purpose of this study was to examine and analyze the major factors influencing knowledge sharing activity in social collaboration. We will present
the structured outcomes model of social collaboration, in the form of factors and sub-factors. Knowledge sharing in social collaboration networks of practice is a socially complex process that involves a variety of participants with different needs and goals. In social networks, individuals share their knowledge and help others despite the lack of a personal, face-to-face relationship and the easy alternative of free-riding on the efforts of others. In social collaboration, group members are motivated by both self-interest and moral regard for their social group. They have self-interested desires for credit and reputation, and they have moral virtues and distaste for taking advantage of others.

People share knowledge in social network because it is enjoyable to help others. They contribute when they are structurally embedded in the network, and when they have experience to share with others. The self-interested collaborators know that many of their colleagues have moral virtues. Accordingly, they do not only merely rely on each other’s self-interest to avoid exploiting the risks inherent in collaboration; they also often morally trust each other. This moral trust is particularly salient in situations when powerlessness and self-defeating detection make it irrational to merely rely on one’s colleagues.
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Appendix. Constructs and measurement items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| We-Intention                        | 1. I intend that our group (i.e. I identified the group before) interact together sometime during the next two weeks.  
2. I intended that our group suggest solution of my problem after posting my question.  
3. We (i.e. I identified the group above) interact together sometime during the next two weeks.  
4. We intend that our group share knowledge to the members. |
| Moral Trust                         | 1. I feel that participation will improve my status in group.  
2. I earn respect from group members after participating in group activity.  
3. I trust that someone in group would help me if I were in a similar situation.  
4. I have confident in my ability to provide knowledge that group member consider valuable. |
| Self-Motivation                     | 1. I enjoy sharing my knowledge in group.  
2. I like to help group member.  
3. I know that other members in group will help me so it’s fair to help them.  
4. It feels good to help group member to solve their problems. |
| Participation in Social Collaboration| 1. People who are important to me would think that I should participate in social collaboration.  
2. People who influence my behavior would think that I should participate in social collaboration.  
3. I am engaged in this activity to contribute to pool of information.  
4. I am engaged in this activity to contribute my knowledge. |
| Knowledge Sharing                   | 1. I believe that group members are willing to share best knowledge with each other.  
2. I believe that knowledge contributed by group members are beneficial for my quarries.  
3. I believe that knowledge share by group members is accurate.  
4. I believe that group members are honest in knowledge sharing. |