



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

경영학석사학위논문

THE INTERACTIVE ROLE OF  
MOTIVATION AND ABILITY FOR  
KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN  
EMPLOYEE NETWORKS

네트워크 중심성, 자발적 동기 및 지식공유능력 간의  
상호작용이 조직 내의 지식공유에 미치는 영향

2014년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

경영학과 인사조직 전공

정 상 윤

# **Abstract**

## The Interactive Role of Motivation and Ability for Knowledge Sharing in Employee Networks

Sangyoon Jung

Business School Human Resource Management Major

The Graduate School

Seoul National University

In the context of knowledge sharing, the inherent characteristic of network position has been controversial: though a central position in the intra-organizational network provides opened access to non-redundant knowledge, its innate lack of trust and reciprocity as “weak ties” has been considered as an impediment to knowledge sharing. However, including motivation and ability as moderators to the formula between network position and knowledge may uplift the hindrance in knowledge sharing. In addition, the concept of knowledge sharing ability is studied in more depth: reflecting the rise of a new communication platform, SNS utilization ability is measured as well as knowledge sharing self-efficacy, a psychological dimension functioning in close with motivation. The results show a partially supported three-way interaction, implying a more complex dynamic at play. The

combination of academically emerging constructs and established constructs will contribute to a deeper understanding of knowledge sharing.

Keywords : knowledge sharing, network centrality, autonomous motivation, ability, SNS, knowledge sharing self-efficacy

*Student Number* : 2008-20574

# 목 차

## Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND Hypotheses Development	4
1. Network Position	5
2. Autonomous Motivation in the context of Network Position	6
3. Interaction between Network Position, Autonomous Motivation and Ability	9
A. Extensive and diverse knowledge	9
B. SNS utilization ability	10
C. Knowledge Sharing Self-efficacy	12
III METHODS	12
1. Data Collection and Research Instrument	13
2. Measures	16
IV RESULTS	21
V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	33
REFERENCES	35
ABSTRACT IN KOREAN	

## **List of Tables**

- Table 1. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics 15
- Table 2. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition (with extensive and diverse knowledge) 23
- Table 3. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision (with extensive and diverse knowledge) 24
- Table 4. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition (with SNS utilization ability) 25
- Table 5. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision (with SNS utilization ability) 26
- Table 6. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition (with knowledge sharing self-efficacy) 27
- Table 7. Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision (with knowledge sharing self-efficacy) 28

## **List of Figures**

- Figure 1. Research model 4
- Figure 2. Three-way Interaction Effect of Network Centrality, Autonomous Motivation and Knowledge sharing ability on Knowledge Provision behavior 30
- Figure 3. Two-way Interaction Effect of Network Centrality and Autonomous Motivation on knowledge sharing behavior 32

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Since knowledge-based service industry has become the core of economy, the notion of knowledge as the foundation of firm's sustainable competitive advantage has been extensively investigated in the human resources management literature (Foss & Pedersen, 2002; Grant, 1996; Kogut & Zander, 1992). That is, in this competitive and dynamic economy of nowadays (Wang & Noe, 2010), knowledge has become the "primary driver of a firm's value" (Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005). Recent research results indicate that proper knowledge management lead to higher profits and performance (Collins & Smith, 2006; Fey & Furu, 2008; Goll, Johnson, & Rasheed, 2007; Thornhill, 2006).

As one knowledge-centered activity, Wang and Noe (2010) deposited the importance of sharing knowledge, as it is "the fundamental means through which employees can contribute to knowledge application, innovation and ultimately the competitive advantage of the organization." Through mutual learning and cooperation, knowledge sharing benefits firms by reducing production costs, shortening project terms, and enhancing team performance. Therefore researchers and managers both aspired to understand the impetus of employees' knowledge sharing.

However, firms also face significant problems in sharing knowledge internally (Haas & Hansen, 2007; Szulanski, 1996; Tsai, 2001). Numerous barriers to knowledge sharing has been identified, including knowledge tacitness (Teece, 1986), limited absorptive capacity of knowledge acquirers (Szulanski, 1996), the tendency of people to hoard knowledge rather than

share to exert power (Davenport, 1997), and absence of trust or reciprocal relations (Levin & Cross, 2003).

Recent literature trends show focus on the characteristics of social networks as a key predictor to overcome the difficulties of knowledge sharing. However conflicting views have dominated the academic scene as scholars have pertained different aspects of social network to knowledge sharing (Hansen, 1999; Mors, 2010; Reagans & Mcevily, 2003). An influential view highlights the networks position fostered by large and open networks which provide access to new and non-redundant knowledge (Burt, 1992; Cross & Cummings, 2004). However as these kind of networks do not nurture trust or reciprocal relations in nature, contrasting views question this link, giving credit to trust and reciprocal norms based on the fact that without trust and reciprocity, these large networks may counterwork knowledge sharing from occurring (Coleman, 1988; Gargiulo, Ertug, & Galunic, 2009; Obstfeld, 2005).


Building upon the study of Reinholt, Pedersen and Foss (2011), this paper attempts to expand the theoretical framework that would bridge this gap in the current literature. As Reinholt et al. grounded their study on behavioral theories of motivation-opportunity-ability by Blumberg and Pringle (1982), this paper also draws on the concept of motivation and knowledge sharing ability to demonstrate how the interaction of motivation and ability transcends the lack of trust and reciprocal norms in open networks. In other words, though the employee's central network position might offer the perfect opportunity to engage in knowledge sharing, without the appropriate motivation and ability to fully explore the opportunity, knowledge sharing will not occur. Focusing on the individual level of knowledge sharing within the organization, this study furthers the research

on employees' knowledge sharing abilities by examining the interaction among network position and autonomous motivation, and in result, influence on knowledge sharing.

This paper contributes to the extension of our understanding of knowledge sharing in several ways. As did the contributions of Reinholt et al. (2011), this research provides an additional explanation for why the opportunities are there, but no knowledge sharing actions. Not only does this paper attempt to provide strong evidence to the answer of the current literature dilemma regarding trust, but also offers a relational explanation of the three predictors– network centrality, autonomous motivation and sharing ability – of knowledge sharing. Adding to the findings of Reinholt et al. (2011), this study further examines the interactional relations and deepens the understanding in knowledge sharing ability in order to expand the horizon of the knowledge sharing literature. It is also notable that existing literature focused mostly on organizational or business unit level rather than on individual level. Moreover, by specifically highlighting the division between controlled and autonomous motivation this paper offers a more sophisticated view into the mechanism of motivation and thus provides a more accurate sense of managerial guideline as in how to encourage the right kind of motivation. Figure 1 represents the hypothesized relations and theoretical model

## II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

**FIGURE 1**  
Theoretical Model



## **1. Network Position**

Recent researches have demonstrated that the centrality of network position influences knowledge sharing in a positive way (Anderson, 2008; Burt, 1992; Tsai, 2001). These findings are grounded in the social network theory where individuals are viewed to be embedded in social structures, to put in another way, “enmeshed in webs of relationships (Vardaman, Amis, Dyson, Wright, & Van de Graaff Randolph, 2012).”

Within these webs of relationships, one’s social context functions both as a channel and as a reservoir at the same time. As Anderson (2008) and Reinholt et al. (2011) stated, “each tie in an employee’s network represents a channel through which knowledge can flow to and from the employee.” Therefore the more ties an employee possess, the more access one has to information and resource. This simultaneously in turn, gives the individual ample opportunities to not only transfer but also accumulate useful and critical knowledge. Whereas an employee who lacks ties, in other words, is outside the focal point of communication and social scene will lack these kinds of opportunities (Wasserman & Faust, 1994).

In parallel with the dual function of network itself, different network positions offer different opportunities in knowledge sharing (Tsai, 2001). That is, network centrality, “the connectedness to others within an organization (McDowell & Voelker, 2008),” serves as an environment for knowledge sharing. Therefore the degree of one’s network centrality functions both as opportunity or constraint in order to receive information, access and control resources, and seek for advice and/or social support (Borgatti, Mehra, Brass, & Labianca, 2009; Burt, 1982). The more central

the position of an employee is, the more numerous networks one possesses, implying more degrees of access and control (Ibarra, 1993). Contrarily peripheral network positions offer little opportunity to transfer or assimilate knowledge which leads to less engagement of knowledge sharing. In short, employee in the center of network is more likely to receive work-wise influential knowledge and also be at the position to engage in knowledge sharing than others.

**Hypothesis 1a. The centrality of an employee's network position is positively associated with the employee's knowledge acquisition.**

**Hypothesis 1b. The centrality of an employee's network position is positively associated with the employee's knowledge provision.**

## **2. Autonomous Motivation in the context of Network Position**

According to Blumberg and Pringle (1982), the individual level of performance is determined by opportunity, willingness, and capacity and in turn, is a partial determinant of each. Building on the well-established motivation–opportunity–ability (MOA) framework, the performance of knowledge sharing will also be determined by the presence and interaction among those three factors. As I have illustrated network centrality as the opportunistic aspect, autonomous motivation will be examined as the second factor. However, following the model structure of Reinholt et al.

(2011), autonomous motivation is viewed within the context of network centrality rather than as an independent factor.

Though central network positions may render favorable conditions to share knowledge, the lack of trust or the burden of psychological and social cost may hinder knowledge sharing (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2002; Obstfeld, 2005). As Granovetter (2005) illustrated high network centrality is associated with large networks and their numerous but “weak” ties. Therefore little trust or reciprocal norms exist. In this environment, to ask for knowledge may be perceived as a sign of weakness or incompetence among colleagues or to oneself. This causes a threat to one’s desired positive self-image or sense of self-worthiness (Bamberger, 2009). On the other hand, knowledge can be perceived as power, and employees may view sharing knowledge a threat to their position. Therefore to share or receive knowledge may be perceived as a threat rather than an opportunity, thus resulting in different levels of engagement in knowledge sharing between employees who possess the equal degree of centrality within their networks.

Brock and Kim (2002) maintained that rather than just encouraging or mandating knowledge sharing, fostering the motivation to share knowledge must precede. In this context, autonomous motivation functions as an alleviator to these obstacles in knowledge sharing. Self-determination theory asserts that different kind of motivations promote different kind of behaviors as well (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Autonomous motivation occurs when an individual engages in a certain behavior on one’s own accord and is comfortable to because the behavior is congruent with the individual’s own interests and values (Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Controlled motivation on the contrast, is derived when there is pressure either externally or self-imposed. External sources refer to rewards or avoiding punishments whereas self-

imposed pressure is culminated through poor integration of external demands. For example, an individual engaging in a particular behavior because the person would feel approved or accepted for doing it, or guilty or unworthy for not (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Therefore autonomous motivation will lead to putting in more efforts for longer hours, show more endurance in the face of difficulty, and feel less insecure compared to controlled motivation. As a result, autonomous motivation will exhibit more positive behavioral outcome than controlled motivation.

Autonomous motivation further implies proactive engagement in utilizing their networks to improve their own knowledge or to help others (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Weinstein & Ryan, 2010). Therefore employees, who are autonomously motivated to share knowledge, will more likely optimize their central position and in turn will strengthen the positive relations between network centrality and knowledge sharing.

**Hypothesis 2a. The positive association between the centrality of an employee's network position and knowledge acquisition is strengthened when the employee is autonomously motivated toward knowledge sharing.**

**Hypothesis 2b. The positive association between the centrality of an employee's network position and knowledge provision is strengthened when the employee is autonomously motivated toward knowledge sharing.**

### **3. Interaction between Network Position, Autonomous Motivation and Ability**

Lastly, in accordance with the classic motivation-opportunity-ability theories, this study focuses on the individuals' knowledge sharing ability in conjunction with their motivation to share knowledge and opportunities offered by their network position. As Blumberg and Pringle (1982) addressed, no single aspect can single handedly educe high level of knowledge sharing. Lower values of any one of the dimension will result in decreased level of knowledge sharing. However, take into account that the influence of knowledge sharing ability and autonomous motivation will only result in high levels of knowledge sharing on the premise of high network centrality. That is, scarce knowledge sharing opportunities will cause low level of knowledge sharing regardless of the high level of ability and motivation.

In addition to the theoretical model of Reinholt et al. (2011), this study expanded the concept of "knowledge sharing ability" by reflecting the current change in organizations and incorporating constructs that has been receiving increasing academic attention. Accordingly, knowledge sharing is operationalized into three distinct constructs: possession of extensive and diverse knowledge (Reinholt et al., 2011), SNS utilization, and knowledge sharing self-efficacy.

#### **A. Extensive and diverse knowledge**

Originally Reinholt et al. (2011) conceptualized knowledge sharing ability as the possession of extensive and diverse knowledge. For knowledge sharing to occur, not only is a central position in the network and

appropriate motivation necessary but also it is essential to have the ability to be able to understand all the knowledge acquired and be able to communicate effectively. This is especially the case of employees with high network centrality, because their network ties tend to bring diverse individuals with disparate knowledge into contact (Burt, 1992). The extensiveness and diversity of knowledge an individual previously possessed improves one's ability to share knowledge as it functions as a broader and deeper foundation to absorb new knowledge (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). Furthermore, it will also function as an instrument to reinterpret or reconstruct the context in order to convey the knowledge in different circumstances (Reagans & McEvily, 2003). Therefore, along with the fulfillment of both opportunity and motivation, competent ability to act upon opportunity is essential in reaching high levels of knowledge sharing.

## **B. SNS utilization ability**

Upon the arrival of Web 2.0, cumulative changes have been made in the way we perceive and/or approach the World Wide Web and our role in it. Business paradigms have shifted and business environments have been altered (Bennett, Owers, Pitt, & Tucker, 2009; O'reilly, 2005). Contrasting to earlier times when people were limited to passive viewing of contents, new platform has emerged enabling user interaction and collaboration via mobile internet, cloud computing and social media and so on. Considering these influences on knowledge sharing, this study attempts to explore a facet of knowledge sharing ability as SNS utilization ability.

Social Network Services (SNS) have infiltrated people's daily life with astounding velocity to become an important social platform for

interaction and communication (Baek, 2011; Correa, Hinsley, & de Zuniga, 2010). By the definition of SNS of Bennett et al. (2009), SNS focuses on “building online communities of people who share interests and/or activities, or who are interested in exploring the interests and activities of others.” The phenomenal success of SNS such as Facebook, twitter, MySpace (Kang & Lee, 2010; Pempek, Yermolayeva, & Yermolayeva, 2009) and so on has proved its succession as the alternative mechanism to the traditional media use (Ardichvili, Page & Wentling, 2003) in connecting, communicating and interacting with each other (Correa et al., 2010). That is, through SNS, the physical limitation of space and time has collapsed, expanding the knowledge sharing space.

The unique social nature and exponential growth of SNS has academics and firms consider profitable ways to embrace social networking as an effective business tool. According to Williamson (2009), social networking tools can help revitalize organizations through harnessing collective intelligence and increasing productivity. Nardi, Whittaker, and Schwarz (2002) underlined that many recognize SNS as efficient means to easily maintain and/or further explore professional or work-related networks.

In the context of network position, the potential of SNS can be explored through the “strength of weak ties” (Granovetter, 1973). According to Granovetter (1973), when a link, or “tie” is weak between individuals there is a much better chance of individuals’ social circles not overlapping. Subsequently there is more opportunity to access new resources, nonredundant information and to connect with new individuals. This is especially the case when an individual possess a central network position, since the network consists of numerous weak ties. High SNS utilization skills will enable this individual to optimize the central network,

manifesting the strength of weak ties. Therefore, individuals holding central network positions with appropriate motivation and SNS utilization ability will exhibit more knowledge sharing behavior.

### **C. Knowledge Sharing Self-efficacy**

As Bandura (1977, 1993) has defined, self-efficacy is people's beliefs in their own ability to influence their lives through completing tasks and reaching goals. In turn, self-efficacy plays a major role in individuals' motivation and behavior regarding tasks, goals and challenges (Bandura, 1982; Igarria & Iivari, 1995). Generally, people with a strong sense of self-efficacy tend to choose more challenging tasks, make more efforts and endure the hardships longer to complete a task compared to those with low self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Therefore self-efficacy has been a credible indicator to exhibit related behaviors.

Several researchers have employed the concept of self-efficacy in the context of knowledge sharing. There have been studies that prove the positive relation between knowledge sharing self-efficacy(KSSE) and knowledge sharing intentions (Bock & Kim, 2002; Hsu, Ju, Yen, & Chang, 2007; Kankanhalli, Tan, & Wei, 2005;). Previous studies have focused on the direct relation or the path KSSE would influence knowledge sharing. However this study examines self-efficacy in an interactional context, where network centrality and autonomous motivation plays a considerable role in knowledge sharing.

**Hypothesis 3a. There is a three-way interaction between the centrality of an employee's network position, autonomous motivation for**

**knowledge sharing, and knowledge-sharing ability: the level of knowledge acquisition is highest when all three dimensions are high.**

**Hypothesis 3b. There is a three-way interaction between the centrality of an employee's network position, autonomous motivation for knowledge sharing, and knowledge-sharing ability: the level of knowledge provision is highest when all three dimensions are high.**

### **III. METHODS**

#### **1. Data Collection and Research Instrument**

To extend the grounds of generalization from previous studies, the data analyzed in this study was collected from various firms across diverse fields. Reinholt et al. (2011) and previous researches regarding network centrality had conducted their survey in one or few companies in order to capture vigorous knowledge sharing activities and gain control for external factors. However this study was designed to collect data from various companies to see if the interactional role of network position, motivation and ability still prevailed. In exception with the scope of companies, the aim was still to involve as many individual employees potentially involved in knowledge sharing as possible.

The survey was distributed three times for the duration of a month, starting from October 19th till November 23rd. In total, 400 questionnaires were handed out and a total of 317 were recovered resulting in almost 80% of response rate. However, due to systematic and/or user missing data, the number of eligible responses free of common method bias was reduced to 241. In the case of the construct for SNS utilization ability, the sample size was further reduced to 204 because the responses of people who did not use any SNS except mobile instant messaging services such as Kakaotalk or Naver Line were excluded. To make sure the survey did not favor a certain company in particular, I received no more than maximum of 30 surveys per one company.

**TABLE 1**  
**Correlations and Descriptive Statistics**

Variables	Mean	s.d.	Min.	Max.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
1. Knowledge acquisition	5.23	1.08	1	7															
2. Knowledge provision	5.10	1.18	1	7															
3. Network centrality	10.57	7.69	0	26	.34	.37													
4. Autonomous motivation	4.71	1.10	3	7	.39	.40	.12												
5. Knowledge sharing ability	4.16	1.19	1	7	.35	.28	.20	.28											
6. Friendship	5.34	1.43	1	7	.29	.39	.22	.24	.15										
7. Independence	5.01	1.42	1	7	-.13	-.14	-.19	.06	-.08	-.07									
8. Informal contacts	5.59	1.24	1	7	.36	.35	.28	.27	.30	.30	-.04								
9. Trust	3.26	1.32	1	7	-.16	-.10	-.20	-.03	-.04	-.02	.09	-.17							
10. Time availability	4.03	1.49	1	7	.00	.10	.16	-.07	-.04	.14	-.16	.16	-.38						
11. Availability of IT systems	4.72	1.48	1	7	.33	.26	.17	.13	.30	.10	-.19	.19	-.15	.01					
12. Tenure	9.61	7.36	1	34	.21	.29	.31	.03	.24	.16	-.28	.17	-.07	.18	.27				
13. Education	2.26	0.56	1	4	-.05	-.05	-.00	-.00	.03	-.02	-.05	-.04	.03	.03	.01	.15			
14. Controlled motivation	3.79	1.27	1	7	.16	.12	-.10	.40	.22	.10	.12	.04	.22	-.14	.11	-.06	.07		
15. Social expectations	5.18	1.15	1	7	.25	.23	.16	.19	.34	.15	-.06	.21	.02	.03	.19	.15	.07	.23	

\*All coefficients above .07 are significant at 5% level; n = 241.

The questionnaire was developed by combining questionnaire items from established literature review. To test and compare the same model of Reinholt, Pedersen and Foss (2011) it was crucial to have the exact same survey items measuring the same construct. Thankfully, I was able to obtain the survey via email from the authors. I translated the questionnaire and to ensure the clarity and integrity of each item and the comprehensiveness of the overall format, asked management scholars for trackback translation, following the usual recommended procedure. SNS utilization ability was operationalized by adapting items from Rha (2010)'s study. Items measuring KSSE were based on studies of Hsu et al. (2007) which was built on the premise of Compeau and Higgins (1995) and Nonaka, Toyama, and Konno(2000). Table 1 shows the mean values, standard deviations, and correlations for all the measured variables. To examine the consistency of the results, measurement invariance was tested. All variables concerned in this study were measured self-reportedly on a seven point Likert scale with the exception of Network centrality which was measured as a single item. Factor analysis was conducted to test each construct's validity and Cronbach's alpha to examine the reliability.

## **2. Measures**

**Knowledge sharing.** In the line of Davenport and Prusak (1998) and Reinholt et al. (2011), knowledge sharing is measured by both aspects of provision and acquisition. Both dependent variables are determined via self-report. Originally Reinholt, Pedersen and Foss (2011) had measured the respondent's acquisition and provision of knowledge from both colleagues

in his or her current project team and colleagues working on other projects. However, since South Korean companies generally work in departments rather than projects, the item was partially altered. Hence, regarding knowledge acquisition, the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they had received/used knowledge from colleagues in other departments (two items) and from within the firm (two items). Knowledge provision items asked the extent of provision within the same criteria. The total of eight items is measured by a seven-point Likert scale anchoring from 1, “no or very little extent,” to 7, “very large extent.” The construct of both Knowledge acquisition and provision was created by averaging the observation of four items. The construct of knowledge acquisition obtained .94 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .83, and .55 for average variance extracted (AVE). Knowledge provision construct obtained .96 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .91, and .71 for average variance extracted (AVE). All these measures indicate a strong and congruent construct.

**Network centrality.** Network centrality was operationalized through degree centrality, which refers to the number of direct contacts an employee has (Freeman, 1978). Degree centrality is considered to be the most appropriate indicator visibly (Freeman, 1979; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). The variable is a single-item measure (the number of contacts in the knowledge network) which is the norm for self-reported facts such as age, education and, as in this case, the number of contacts in a network (Wanous, Reichers, & Hudy, 1997).

**Autonomous motivation.** In order to differentiate the types of motivation that lead to specific behaviors, the widely accepted Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SRQ; Ryan & Connell, 1989) was adapted into the context of knowledge sharing. As Reinholt et al. (2011) clarified, this research focuses on the leading aspect of motivation to a “specific behavior (such as knowledge sharing) over time” rather than a “general and stable personality trait.” Respondents were asked what the underlying reason was for taking part in knowledge sharing. As have previous researchers, the SRQ measure of intrinsic and identified motivation is used to estimate autonomous motivation. Items considered to construct the autonomous motivation were such as, “...because I enjoy it” (intrinsic), “...because I like it” (intrinsic), “...because I find it personally satisfying” (identified), and “...because I think it is an important part of my job” (identified). Respondents answered in a seven-point Likert scale anchoring from 1, “strongly disagree,” to 7, “strongly agree.” The construct of autonomous motivation was calculated by averaging the four items observed values. The construct obtained .78 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .65, and .38 for average variance extracted (AVE).

**Knowledge-sharing ability.** a. Extensive and diverse knowledge. Previous researches such as Cohen and Levinthal (1990) and Reinholt et al. (2011) have conceptualized knowledge-sharing ability in terms of prior knowledge extensiveness and diversity. They argue that abundant preexisting knowledge in an individual level functions as a fertile

foundation to learn from others and/or in explaining what one knows to others. Therefore survey items asked the respondents the extent of involvement in (general and specialized) training, job rotation, and career development. These activities were thought to have given access to company-specific knowledge and help widen the knowledge base. Respondents answered in a seven-point Likert scale anchoring from 1, “no or very little extent,” to 7, “very large extent”. The construct of knowledge sharing ability as extensive and diverse knowledge was calculated by averaging the four items’ observed values. The construct obtained .82 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .67, and .35 for average variance extracted (AVE).

b. SNS utilization ability. This construct was calculated by averaging the observed value of four items adapted from Rha (2010)’s study: whether an individual comments or write/upload contents on the internet, and whether the purpose of SNS is to share or transfer contents across the internet or to share one’s own contents on the internet. This construct is a more behavioral indicator compared to the general quantitative measure which was usually operationalized by calculating frequency or time spent on SNS (Correa et al., 2010). The respondents answered in a seven-point Likert scale anchoring from 1, “no or very little extent,” to 7, “very large extent”. The construct of knowledge sharing ability as SNS utilization ability was calculated by averaging the four items’ observed values. The construct obtained .81 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .55, and .24 for average variance extracted (AVE).

c. Knowledge sharing self-efficacy. This construct was calculated by averaging the observed value of four items that were adapted from the

study of Hsu et al. (2007), which had strong grounds in measuring KSSE (Compeau and Higgins, 1995; Nonaka, Toyama, and Konno, 2000). The four items asked to the respondents were regarding confidence of sharing knowledge and the ways to provide it within the company. The respondents answered in a seven-point Likert scale anchoring from 1, “no or very little extent,” to 7, “very large extent”. The construct of knowledge sharing ability as KSSE obtained .93 for Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability of .89, and .67 for average variance extracted (AVE).

### **Control Variables**

A number of control variables were added to control for knowledge-sharing opportunities innate in employees’ jobs such as friendship, trust (reverse-coded), informal contacts, independence, time availability (reverse-coded), availability of IT systems, tenure, education and controlled motivation. All questions were measured on a seven-point Likert scale.

It was necessary to control for trust as it was emphasized as the critical variable in which affected the vitality of knowledge sharing (Levin & Cross, 2003). The question asked if “there was a trusting climate among employees.” Social expectations were also controlled in order to exclude the possible influence of social desires on knowledge sharing. On a seven-point scale, respondents were asked to assess the extent to which one agrees with the statement “I share knowledge in accordance with the company’s expectations.” In the same context, some aspects of ability, e.g. tenure and education, needed to be differentiated from the knowledge sharing ability

construct. Moreover, to specifically see autonomous motivation at work, any potential influences of controlled motivation had to be suppressed as well. As with the autonomous motivation variable, respondents were asked to assess their underlying reasons for engaging in knowledge sharing. The construct consists of five items adapted from the SRQ questionnaire that measured external and introjected motivations. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is .91, composite reliability of .81, and .52 for average variance extracted (AVE). The construct was calculated as the average of the five items.

#### **IV. RESULTS**

Following the procedure performed by Reinholt et al. (2011), this study conducted hierarchical moderated regression models to examine the proposed hypotheses. The concept of knowledge sharing was investigated in two dimensions: knowledge provision and acquisition. These two dependent variables were self-reported on a seven point Likert scale. The independent variables were employees' network centrality, autonomous motivation and all three knowledge sharing abilities, namely the extensiveness and diversity of knowledge, SNS utilization ability and knowledge sharing self-efficacy (KSSE). All of the independent variables were also self-reported on a seven point Likert scale except for network centrality. Though self-reported, network centrality was a single item measure. To consider this difference in scale, all concerning variables in relation with interaction terms were standardized before being created to interaction terms. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was tested to see if there was a problem of

multicollinearity, but as presented together with the regression results in Tables 2 to 7, all VIF values were smaller than 10 confirming no problem of multicollinearity had occurred.

All models included an identical set of control variables as addressed by Reinholt et al. (2011): friendship, independence, informal contacts, trust, time availability, and availability of IT systems. These factors were controlled on account of potential influence on opportunities to share knowledge. Furthermore, additional factors were controlled such as tenure, education, controlled motivation, and social expectations as well to estimate the sole influence of the independent variables. Hierarchical moderated regression was performed step by step. Model 1 only included the controlled variable. In model 2, all first-order associations between knowledge sharing and network centrality, autonomous motivation and knowledge sharing abilities were added to the process. Model 3 incorporated the two way interactions and model 4 proceeded to include the hypothesized three way interaction among independent variables.

**TABLE 2**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Acquisition			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.52	2.74 ***	2.69 ***	2.70 ***
Network centrality		0.26 **	0.27 ***	0.29 ***
Autonomous motivation		0.14	0.16	0.18 *
Knowledge-sharing ability		0.17 *	0.18 *	0.17 *
Autonomous motivation × network centrality			-0.23 **	-0.22 **
Autonomous motivation × Knowledge-sharing ability			0.07	0.08
Network centrality × Knowledge-sharing ability			-0.15 *	-0.15 *
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × Knowledge-sharing ability				-0.05
Friendship	0.19 **	0.14 *	0.13 *	0.13 *
Independence	-0.10	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
Informal contacts	0.16 **	0.10	0.10	0.10
Trust	0.07	0.03	0.03	0.03
Time availability	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.00
Availability of IT systems	0.18 **	0.14 *	0.14 **	0.14 **
Tenure	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.01
Education	-0.05	-0.11	-0.07	-0.06
Controlled motivation	0.17 **	0.14 *	0.11	0.11
Social expectations	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.03
F	8.18 ***	8.17 ***	8.22 ***	7.76 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.26	0.32	0.37	0.37
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.28	0.32	0.32
F change		6.29 ***	6.08 **	0.61

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

- \* p < .05
- \*\* p < .01
- \*\*\* p < .001

**TABLE 3**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Provision			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.56	2.76 **	2.71 **	2.75 **
Network centrality		0.26 **	0.27 **	0.31 ***
Autonomous motivation		1.27	1.28	1.34
Knowledge-sharing ability		0.20 *	0.22 *	0.29 **
		1.28	1.34	1.54
Autonomous motivation × network centrality		0.11	0.12	0.11
		1.36	1.41	1.41
Autonomous motivation × Knowledge-sharing ability			-0.20 *	-0.19 *
			1.30	1.30
Network centrality × Knowledge-sharing ability			0.08	0.10
			1.32	1.33
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × Knowledge-sharing ability			-0.14	-0.16 *
			1.17	1.18
				-0.14 *
				1.28
Friendship	0.22 ***	0.17 **	0.17 **	0.16 **
	1.14	1.19	1.19	1.19
Independence	-0.08	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07
	1.14	1.15	1.17	1.17
Informal contacts	0.15 *	0.09	0.10	0.09
	1.21	1.30	1.31	1.31
Trust	-0.01	-0.05	-0.05	-0.04
	1.28	1.31	1.33	1.34
Time availability	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.07
	1.25	1.29	1.29	1.29
Availability of IT systems	0.14 *	0.11	0.12 *	0.12 *
	1.19	1.23	1.23	1.23
Tenure	0.20 **	0.03 *	0.03 *	0.03 *
	1.23	1.32	1.33	1.33
Education	-0.04	-0.08	-0.04	-0.01
	1.04	1.04	1.05	1.05
Controlled motivation	0.13 *	0.09	0.07	0.08
	1.15	1.35	1.38	1.38
Social expectations	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.04
	1.15	1.21	1.25	1.27
F	7.77 ***	7.61 ***	7.23 ***	7.19 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.25	0.30	0.34	0.35
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.22	0.26	0.29	0.30
F change		5.56 **	4.20 **	4.65 *

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

- \* p < .05
- \*\* p < .01
- \*\*\* p < .001

**TABLE 4**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Acquisition			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.67 *	2.67 **	2.68 **	2.45 **
Network centrality		0.27 **	0.28 **	0.33 ***
		<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.44</i>
Autonomous motivation		0.22 *	0.25 **	0.26 **
		<i>1.36</i>	<i>1.49</i>	<i>1.50</i>
SNS Utilization ability		0.05	0.05	0.07
		<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.20</i>
Autonomous motivation × network centrality			-0.19 *	-0.22 **
			<i>1.26</i>	<i>1.34</i>
Autonomous motivation × SNS Utilization ability			0.07	0.06
			<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.29</i>
Network centrality × SNS Utilization ability			-0.01	-0.01
			<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.29</i>
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × SNS Utilization ability				-0.13
				<i>1.40</i>
Friendship	0.16 *	0.11	0.10	0.10
	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.23</i>
Independence	-0.12	-0.10	-0.10	-0.09
	<i>1.13</i>	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.15</i>
Informal contacts	0.17 *	0.11	0.11	0.12
	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Trust	0.10	0.06	0.04	0.04
	<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.32</i>	<i>1.32</i>
Time availability	-0.07	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03
	<i>1.26</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Availability of IT systems	0.15 *	0.12 *	0.12 *	0.12 *
	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.22</i>
Tenure	0.15 *	0.02	0.02	0.02
	<i>1.24</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.40</i>	<i>1.40</i>
Education	-0.06	-0.14	-0.09	-0.04
	<i>1.05</i>	<i>1.07</i>	<i>1.09</i>	<i>1.12</i>
Controlled motivation	0.16 *	0.13	0.14	0.13
	<i>1.18</i>	<i>1.34</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Social expectations	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.09
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.18</i>	<i>1.20</i>
F	7.31 ***	7.41 ***	6.66 ***	6.53 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.27	0.34	0.36	0.37
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.24	0.29	0.31	0.32
F change		5.91 **	2.58	3.21

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001

**TABLE 5**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Provision			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.73	2.84 **	2.84 **	2.63 **
Network centrality		0.28 **	0.29 **	0.34 ***
		<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.44</i>
Autonomous motivation		0.26 **	0.27 **	0.28 **
		<i>1.36</i>	<i>1.49</i>	<i>1.50</i>
SNS Utilization ability		0.05	0.05	0.07
		<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.20</i>
Autonomous motivation × network centrality			-0.16	-0.19 *
			<i>1.26</i>	<i>1.34</i>
Autonomous motivation × SNS Utilization ability			0.05	0.04
			<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.29</i>
Network centrality × SNS Utilization ability			0.01	0.01
			<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.29</i>
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × SNS Utilization ability				-0.12
				<i>1.40</i>
Friendship	0.19 **	0.14 *	0.13 *	0.13 *
	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.23</i>
Independence	-0.10	-0.08	-0.08	-0.08
	<i>1.13</i>	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.15</i>
Informal contacts	0.15 *	0.09	0.10	0.10
	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Trust	0.01	-0.04	-0.05	-0.05
	<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.32</i>	<i>1.32</i>
Time availability	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.04
	<i>1.26</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Availability of IT systems	0.10	0.08	0.08	0.08
	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.22</i>
Tenure	0.24 ***	0.04 **	0.04 **	0.04 **
	<i>1.24</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.40</i>	<i>1.40</i>
Education	-0.03	-0.07	-0.03	0.02
	<i>1.05</i>	<i>1.07</i>	<i>1.09</i>	<i>1.12</i>
Controlled motivation	0.12	0.09	0.09	0.09
	<i>1.18</i>	<i>1.34</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Social expectations	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.18</i>	<i>1.20</i>
F	6.87 ***	7.13 ***	6.10 ***	5.93 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.26	0.33	0.34	0.35
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.22	0.28	0.29	0.29
F change		6.16 **	1.43	2.44

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001

**TABLE 6**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Acquisition<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Acquisition			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.52	2.50 **	2.57 **	2.62 **
Network centrality		0.27 **	0.23 **	0.26 **
		<i>1.27</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.48</i>
Autonomous motivation		0.13	0.16	0.19 *
		<i>1.39</i>	<i>1.41</i>	<i>1.53</i>
Knowledge sharing self-efficacy		0.06	0.06	0.07
		<i>1.49</i>	<i>1.67</i>	<i>1.68</i>
Autonomous motivation × network centrality			-0.27 ***	-0.24 **
			<i>1.19</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Autonomous motivation × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy			0.04	0.03
			<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.35</i>
Network centrality × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy			0.15	0.14
			<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.33</i>
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy				-0.08
				<i>1.45</i>
Friendship	0.19 **	0.13 *	0.13 *	0.13 *
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.24</i>
Independence	-0.10	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>
Informal contacts	0.16 **	0.12	0.11	0.10
	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.34</i>
Trust	0.07	0.03	-0.01	0.00
	<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Time availability	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
	<i>1.25</i>	<i>1.27</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Availability of IT systems	0.18 **	0.15 **	0.15 **	0.15 **
	<i>1.19</i>	<i>1.20</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.21</i>
Tenure	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.01
	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.38</i>
Education	-0.05	-0.14	-0.13	-0.13
	<i>1.04</i>	<i>1.06</i>	<i>1.07</i>	<i>1.07</i>
Controlled motivation	0.17 **	0.16 *	0.16 *	0.16 *
	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.33</i>	<i>1.35</i>	<i>1.36</i>
Social expectations	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06
	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>
F	8.18 ***	7.78 ***	7.71 ***	7.35 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.26	0.31	0.35	0.36
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.27	0.31	0.31
F change		5.04 **	5.42 **	1.38

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

\* p < .05

\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001

**TABLE 7**  
**Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis on Knowledge Provision<sup>a</sup>**

Variables	Knowledge Provision			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Intercept	1.56	3.52 ***	3.50 ***	3.52 ***
Network centrality		0.24 **	0.23 *	0.24 *
		<i>1.27</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.48</i>
Autonomous motivation		0.11	0.13	0.14
		<i>1.39</i>	<i>1.41</i>	<i>1.53</i>
Knowledge sharing self-efficacy		0.35 ***	0.32 **	0.32 **
		<i>1.49</i>	<i>1.67</i>	<i>1.68</i>
Autonomous motivation × network centrality			-0.17 *	-0.15
			<i>1.19</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Autonomous motivation × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy			-0.01	-0.02
			<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.35</i>
Network centrality × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy			0.04	0.03
			<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.33</i>
Autonomous motivation × Network centrality × Knowledge sharing self-efficacy				-0.04
				<i>1.45</i>
Friendship	0.22 ***	0.14 *	0.14 *	0.14 *
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.22</i>	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.24</i>
Independence	-0.08	-0.09	-0.09	-0.09
	<i>1.14</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>
Informal contacts	0.15 *	0.07	0.08	0.07
	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.29</i>	<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.34</i>
Trust	-0.01	-0.07	-0.08	-0.08
	<i>1.28</i>	<i>1.31</i>	<i>1.37</i>	<i>1.37</i>
Time availability	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.05
	<i>1.25</i>	<i>1.27</i>	<i>1.30</i>	<i>1.30</i>
Availability of IT systems	0.14 *	0.11	0.11	0.11
	<i>1.19</i>	<i>1.20</i>	<i>1.21</i>	<i>1.21</i>
Tenure	0.20 **	0.02	0.02	0.02
	<i>1.23</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.38</i>	<i>1.38</i>
Education	-0.04	-0.17	-0.16	-0.16
	<i>1.04</i>	<i>1.06</i>	<i>1.07</i>	<i>1.07</i>
Controlled motivation	0.13 *	0.12	0.12	0.12
	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.33</i>	<i>1.35</i>	<i>1.36</i>
Social expectations	0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02
	<i>1.15</i>	<i>1.16</i>	<i>1.17</i>	<i>1.17</i>
F	7.77 ***	8.98 ***	7.74 ***	7.28 ***
R <sup>2</sup>	0.25	0.34	0.36	0.36
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.22	0.30	0.31	0.31
F change		10.00 ***	1.91	0.28

<sup>a</sup> All independent variables are standardized. Values in italic are VIFs.

\* p < .05


\*\* p < .01

\*\*\* p < .001

Table 2 and 3 demonstrates the relations between knowledge sharing, both acquisition and provision, and central network position and autonomous motivation, and knowledge sharing ability as extensive and diverse prior knowledge. Table 4 and 5 also depicts the same relation with the exception of knowledge sharing ability being operationalized as SNS utilization ability. Lastly, table 6 and 7 presents the same association but knowledge sharing ability indicates knowledge sharing self-efficacy.

Among the predicted three way interactions, only the three way interaction among independent variables of network centrality and autonomous motivation, and knowledge sharing ability as extensive and diverse knowledge related to knowledge provision showed a statistically significant result. As table 3 presents, this model also exhibited a statistically significant increase in variance explained by .01 ( $F=4.65$ ,  $p<.05$ ). The  $R^2$  increased from .50 in model 1 to .60 in model 4, a 10 percent increase. This level of increase of individual knowledge provision will have an important impact on the overall performance of the organization.

**FIGURE 2**  
**Three-way Interaction with Knowledge Provision as Dependent Variable**



To understand the results in depth, I followed the procedures formalized by Aiken and West (1991), plotting the three way interaction according to the high and low levels of each variable. The pattern of figure 2 describes the interactional results in regard to hypothesis 3b. Interestingly, the highest level of self-reported knowledge provision is when the employee possessed low network centrality, high autonomous motivation and high knowledge sharing ability, i.e. extensive and diverse prior knowledge as well. On the contrary, employees in the central of network showed, despite the high autonomous motivation and extensive and diverse prior knowledge, decreased level of knowledge sharing. Therefore, hypothesis 3b was not supported.

To report for completeness, the significant relation between network centrality and the self-reported knowledge provision (beta= .262,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 3), and between knowledge acquisition (beta= .263,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 2) was statistically significant. The two way interaction between network centrality and autonomous motivation also tested statistically significant (beta= - .200,  $p < .05$ ; model 3, Table 3, beta= - .227,  $p < .01$ ; model 3, Table 2).


Since all the other models did not yield statistically significant results regarding the hypothesized three way interactions, simple relations and two way interaction interpretations is in line. In the cases association between network centrality and self-reported knowledge acquisition, both knowledge sharing ability as SNS utilization ability and KSSE resulted in significant statistics (beta= .270,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 4; beta= .269,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 6). The moderated relations between network centrality and autonomous motivation in knowledge acquisition also showed similar results (beta= - .191,  $p < .05$ ; model 3, Table 4; beta= - .272,  $p < .001$ ; model 3, Table 6).

Knowledge provision and central network position also posited a positive relation in both SNS utilization ability and KSSE (beta= .280,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 5; beta= .243,  $p < .01$ ; model 2, Table 7) The interaction coefficient between network centrality and autonomous motivation also revealed to be statistically significant in KSSE ((beta= - .169,  $p < .05$ ; model 3, Table 7); However in the notion of SNS utilization ability, the interactional relation did not prove to be statistically important.

Therefore hypothesis 1a and 1b, positing a positive relation between network centrality and self-reported knowledge sharing were all supported across all regression models. Hypothesis 2a and 2b, predicting a positive

moderating effect of autonomous motivation on the relation of network centrality and knowledge sharing, also displayed a statistically significant result. With the exception of SNS utilization of ability as knowledge sharing ability, where Hypothesis 2b did not yield a statistically significant result. To further understand the nature of the moderating effect, I plotted the two way interaction as Dawson and Richter (2006) specified. As Figure 3 shows, autonomous motivation has a negative moderating effect on the relation between network centrality and knowledge sharing, as in both knowledge provision and acquisition.

**FIGURE 3**  
**Two-way Interaction with Knowledge Sharing as Dependent Variable**



## **V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: Contributions and Limitations**

In the context of knowledge sharing, the inherent characteristic of network position has been controversial: though a central position in the intra-organizational network provides opened access to non-redundant knowledge, its innate attribute as “weak ties” that lack mutual trust has been considered as an impediment to knowledge sharing. Grounded on the behavioral theories of motivation-opportunity-ability (Blumberg & Pringle, 1982), Reinholt et al. (2011) demonstrates how the large open network can be fully explored in the premise of autonomous motivation and knowledge sharing ability. That is, knowledge sharing is highest when all three elements of network centrality, motivation and ability are high. Network centrality not only presents numerous opportunities to transfer and accumulate knowledge but also open doors to new and non-repetitive information. However, this opportunity is seized only by whom who is motivated on one’s own volition and possesses knowledge sharing ability; therefore countervailing the shortcomings of central position of networks.

In attempt to extend the findings of Reinholt et al. (2011), while maintaining the gist of it, this study examines the generalizability of the research model by expanding the sample to multiple companies across diverse fields. In addition, the concept of knowledge sharing ability is studied in more depth: reflecting the rise of a new communication platform, SNS utilization ability is measured as well as knowledge sharing self-efficacy, a psychological dimension functioning in close with motivation. The combination of academically emerging constructs and established

constructs will contribute to deeper understanding of knowledge sharing and have managerial implications.

The results showed that the highest level of self-reported knowledge provision is when the employee possessed low network centrality, high autonomous motivation and high knowledge sharing ability, i.e. extensive and diverse prior knowledge. Though all models did prove strong associations between network centrality and knowledge sharing, this suggests an even greater power of motivation and ability that gives the strength to overcome unfavorable environments. Another finding included the negative moderating effect of autonomous motivation. Previous literature regarding autonomous motivation heavily concentrates on positive influences. Negative influences are academically rarely reported.

Results of this study could only be properly interpreted in the light of its limitations: the focus on quantitative traits opposed to qualitative traits may have prevented an integrative understanding from all viewpoints. The study was designed to focus on the occurrence of the knowledge sharing itself, rather than the quality of knowledge shared. By indirectly asking to what extent one used the knowledge obtained however does imply the usefulness of the knowledge. Network centrality was measured by a proxy of degree centrality which its simplicity helped to see relations clearly. However the quality or pathway of network was not considered despite the potential influence on knowledge sharing. For future research, a more sophisticated measure can be incorporated to reflect a more dimensional understanding of the network and its dynamic in the knowledge sharing literature.

## REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Anderson, M. H. (2008). Social Networks and the cognitive motivation to realize network opportunities: A study of managers' information gathering behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 51-78.

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), 64-77.

Baek, I. (2011). The future prospect and development direction of SNS based knowledge management system for the government. *IT & Future Strategy*, 6, 1-24.

Bamberger, P. (2009). Employee help-seeking: Antecedents, consequences and new insights for future research. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, 28, 49–98.

Bandura, A. (1977). Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.

Bennett, J., Owers, M., Pitt, M., & Tucker, M. (2010). Place impact of social networking. *Property Management*, 28(3), 138-148.

Blumberg, M., & Pringle, C. D. (1982). The Missing Opportunity in Organizational Research: Some Implications for a Theory of Work Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 560-569.

Bock, G. W., & Kim, Y. (2002). Breaking the Myths of Rewards: An Exploratory Study of Attitudes about Knowledge Sharing. *Information Resources Management Journal*, 15(2), 14-21.

Bock G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. & Lee, J. (2005). Behavioral Intention Formation in Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Social-psychological Forces, and Organizational Climate. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 87-111.

Borgatti, S. P., Mehra, A., Brass, D. J., & Labianca, G. (2009). Network Analysis in the Social Sciences. *Science*, 323(5916), 892-895.

Burt, R. S. (1982). *Toward a structural theory of action: Network models of social Structure, Perception, and Action*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: the social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cabrera, Á., & Cabrera, E. F. (2002). Knowledge sharing dilemmas. *Organization Studies*, 23(5), 687–710.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

Collins, C. J., & Smith, K. J. (2006). Knowledge Exchange and Combination: The Role of Human Resource Practices in the Performance of High-Technology Firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 544-560.

Compeau, D.R., Higgins, C.A., (1995). Computer self-efficacy development of a measure and initial test. *MIS Quarterly*, 19 (2), 189–211.

Correa, T., Hinsley, A. W., & de Zuniga, H. G. (2010). Who interacts on the Web?: The intersection of users' personality and social media use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 247–253.

Cross, R., & Cummings, J. N. (2004). Tie and network correlates of individual performance in knowledge-intensive work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 928-937.

Dawson, J. F., & Richter, A. W. (2006). Probing three-way interactions in moderated multiple regression: Development and application of a slope difference test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 917-926.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

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), 227–268.

Degenne, A., & Forse, M. (1999). *Introducing social networks*. Trowbridge, Wiltshire, UK: SAGE.

Davenport, T. H. (1997). Ten principles of knowledge management and four case studies. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 4(3), 187-208.

Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Fey, C. F., & Furu, P. (2008). Top management incentive compensation and knowledge sharing in multinational corporations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(12), 1301–1323.

Foss, N. J., & Pedersen, T. (2002). Transferring knowledge in MNCs: The role of sources of subsidiary knowledge and organizational context. *Journal*

of *International Management*, 8(1), 49–67.

Freemanm, L. C. (1978) Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification, *Social Networks*, 1(3), 215–239.

Gargiulo, M., Ertug, G., & Galunic, C. (2009). The two faces of control: Network closure and individual performance among knowledge workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54, 299-333.

Goll, I., Johnson, N. B., & Rasheed, A. A. (2007). Knowledge capability, strategic change, and firm performance: The moderating role of the environment. *Management Decision*, 45(2), 161-179

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360–1380

Granovetter, M. S. (2005). The impact of social structure on economic outcomes. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(1), 33–50.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 109-122.

Haas, M. R., & Hansen, M. T. (2007). Different knowledge, different benefits: toward a productivity perspective on knowledge sharing in organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 1133-1153.

Hansen, M. T. (1999). The search-transfer problem: the role of weak ties in

sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44 (1), 82-111.

Hansen, M. T., Mors, M. L., & Lovas, B. (2005). Knowledge sharing in organizations: multiple networks, multiple phases. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48 (5), 776-793.

Hsu, M., Ju, T. L., Yen, C., & Chang, C. (2007). Knowledge sharing behavior in virtual communities: The relationship between trust, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 65(2), 153-169.

Ibarra, H. (1993). Network centrality, power, and innovation involvement: determinants of technical and administrative roles. *Academy Of Management Journal*, 36(3), 471-501.

Igbaria, M., & Iivari, J. (1995). The effects of self-efficacy on computer usage. *Omega*, 23(6), 587-605.

Inkpen, A. C., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2005). Social Capital, Networks and Knowledge Transfer. *Academy of Management Review*, 30 (1), 146-165.

Kang, Y. S., & Lee, H. (2010). Understanding the role of an IT artifact in online service continuance: An extended perspective of user satisfaction. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 353-364.

Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., & Wei, K. (2005). Contributing Knowledge

to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation. *MIS Quarterly*, 29(1), 113-143.

Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, Combinative capabilities, and the Replication of Technology. *Organization Science*, 3(3), 383-397.

Levin, D. Z., & Cross, R. (2003). The strength of weak ties you can trust: the mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science*, 50 (11), 1477-1490.

McDowell, W. C., & Voelker, T. A. (2008). Information, Resources and Transaction Cost Economics: The Effects of Informal Network Centrality on Teams and Team Performance. *Journal Of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 9(2), 134-147.

Mcevily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Network Structure and Knowledge Transfer: The Effects of Cohesion and Range. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2), 240-267.

Mors, M. L., (2010). Innovation in a global consulting firm: When the problem is too much diversity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31, 841-872

Nardi, B.A., Whittaker, S., & Schwarz, H. (2002). Networkers and their Activity in Intensional Networks. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 11(1-2), 205-242.

Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning* (33), 5–34.

Obstfeld, D. (2005). Social Networks, the Tertius Iungens Orientation, and Involvement in Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(1), 100-130.

Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F., Skvoretz, J. (2010). Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. *Social Networks*, 32(3), 245–251.

O'reilly, T. (2005, September). What Is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software, Retrieved from <http://oreilly.com/web2/archive/what-is-web-20.html>

Pempek, T. A., Yermolayeva, Y. A., & Yermolayeva, S. L. (2009). College students' social networking experiences on Facebook. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30, 227–238.

Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived locus of causality and internalization: Examining reasons for acting in two domains. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 749–761.

Reinholt, M., Pedersen, T., & Foss, N. J. (2011). Why a Central Network Position Isn't Enough: The Role of Motivation and Ability for Knowledge Sharing in Employee Networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6),

1277-1297.

Rha, J. (2010). Consumers' Usage of online social networks: application of Use-diffusion model. *Journal of Consumer Studies*, 21(2), 443-472.

Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring Internal Stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 27-43.

Sparrowe, R. T., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). Social Networks and the Performance of Individuals and Groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 316-325.

Tsai, W. (2001). Knowledge transfer in interorganizational networks: effects of network position and absorptive capacity on business unit innovation and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 996-1004.

Tsai, W. (2002). Social structure of 'coopetition' within a multiunit organization: coordination, competition, and interorganizational knowledge sharing. *Organization Science*, 13(2), 179-190.

Teece, D. (1986). Profiting from technical innovation: implications for integration, collaboration, licensing, and public policy. *Research Policy*, 15 (6), 285-305.

Thornhill, S. (2006). Knowledge, innovation and firm performance in high- and low-technology regimes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(50), 687–703.

Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 115–131.

Wanous, J. P., Reichers, A. E., & Hudy, M. J. (1997). Overall job satisfaction: How good are single-item measures? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 247–252.

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Weinstein, N., & Ryan, R. M. (2010). When helping helps: Autonomous motivation for prosocial behavior and its influence on well-being for the helper and recipient. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98(2), 222–244.

Williamson, B. (2009, July 27). Managing at a distance. Retrieved from <http://www.zimbio.com/BusinessWeek/articles/vXJT1mLEdwz/MANAGING+AT+A+DISTANCE>

Vardaman, J. M., Amis, J. M., Dyson, B. P., Wright, P. M., & Van de Graaff Randolph, R. (2012). Interpreting change as controllable: The role of network centrality and self-efficacy. *Human Relations*, 65(7), 835-859. O

## 요약(국문초록)

지식기반사회의 21 세기에서 경쟁하는 기업들에게 조직구성원간의 지식공유는 기업의 핵심역량과 밀접한 연관을 갖는 핵심화두다. 특히 조직 내 네트워크의 위치 요인이 지식공유에 미치는 영향에 관해서는 논란이 계속되어 왔다. 이는 네트워크 중심성이 높을수록 정보에 대한 접근성이 높아지는 반면에 약한 유대감으로 인해 실제 지식공유가 이루어지지 않는다는 논란이다. 본 연구에서는 그러한 논란에 마침표를 찍고, 네트워크의 위치 요인이 지식 공유에 긍정적으로 영향을 미칠 수 있음을 주장한다. 즉, 자발적 동기와 지식공유능력이 상호작용을 통해 네트워크 위치 요인과 지식공유 간의 관계를 조절하여 네트워크 중심성이 가지는 약한 유대감의 문제점을 극복하고 지식공유가 이루어지는 것이다. 그리고 더 나아가, 지식공유능력을 입체적으로 개념화하여 지식공유에 미치는 영향을 다각도에서 살펴보고자 하였다. 즉, 소셜 네트워크 서비스의 부상하는 오늘날의 판도를 반영하여 지식공유능력을 SNS 활용능력으로 상정하고, 또 지식자기효능감을 측정하여 실제 능력과 별개로 심리적인 영향이 지식공유에 미치는 영향을 분석해 보았다. 그 결과, 부분적으로 네트워크 위치요인과 자발적동기, 지식공유능력 간의 상호작용이 통계적으로 유의함을 밝혀냈다.

주요어: 지식공유, 네트워크 중심성, 자발적 동기, 능력, SNS,  
지식자기효능감

학 번: 2008-20574