

Knowledge Sharing Attitude: An Exploratory Study among University Students

Salih Yeşil

Assoc. Prof. Dr.

Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi

Mihriban Hatunoğlu

Graduate Student,

Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi

Abstract

Currently, society pay a great deal of attention to be successful, the secret of increase success is to share, for this reason, many system of education and educators put emphasis on the importance of knowledge sharing among students. However little is known about the determinants of the knowledge sharing behavior. In our study we tried to find out some of those determinants that positively or negatively effect on these behaviors. The objective of this study is to contribute to the limited previous researches on knowledge sharing among university students and further develop an understanding of relevant subject, by portraying the attitudes and intentions towards knowledge sharing among university students in Turkey. A questionnaire-based survey was used to collect the data. Respondents were received from 266 undergraduates in Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University (KSU). Respondents had a positive attitudes and intentions towards knowledge sharing. We confirm that internet as a source for study-related tool significantly contributed to preferred resource for knowledge sharing and obtained as the most preferred form of sharing knowledge is interestingly telephone. We also observed that among factors limiting of knowledge sharing, lack of depth in relationships is essential factor for limiting sharing and some supplementary findings. As expected, this paper demonstrates that students do have an eagered knowledge sharing culture, finally, that culture is collectivist in nature and to some extent self-serving and instrumental.

Keywords: Knowledge Sharing, University Students, Turkey

1. Introduction

Knowledge means awareness or familiarity gained by experience of a fact or situation. It has become a norm to refer strength, priority right of choice and superiority in the understanding of our age. With this understanding, knowledge become an indispensable factor. Having said that, knowledge management is as important as knowledge. Knowledge management came to existence as a concept in the later twentieth century. It has contained knowledge sharing (KS). Knowledge sharing varies from knowledge

exchange and knowledge transfer. Knowledge transfer contains both the sharing of knowledge by the knowledge acquisition and the resource and application of knowledge by the receiver. "Knowledge transfer" often has been used to define the movement of knowledge between different partitions, units, or organizations rather than individuals (Szulanski et al., 2004). Knowledge sharing indicates to the provision of task information and know-how to help others and to collaborate with others to solve troubles, develop new opinions, or implement procedures or policies (Cummings, et al., 2004). Knowledge sharing can happen by way of written, face-to-face or correspondence communications via networking with other expertises, or organizing, capturing, and documenting knowledge for others (Pulakos et al., 2003). Knowledge sharing is considered to be one of the most important configuration of knowledge management (Gupta et al., 2000). Also it does play an important role in the success of students.

Knowledge sharing among university students has been noticed as an important and interesting field of study in the academic world (Wei et al., 2012:327). With the growing emphasis on collaborative work in institutions, universities have been settled with curriculum to engage students in collaborative learning which permits them to reflect and learn more effectively (Walker, 2002). Thus how to take advantage of knowledge in order to create the greatest value is becoming the central concern in the new education system.

In recent years new developed teaching methods have required further knowledge sharing via laboratory environment, group assignments etc. Many instructor have attempted to solve the issue by identifying remarkable features of the sharing-based the system of education and formulating various strategies to create a new source of competitive advantage in the academic world. However most studies related to the knowledge sharing behavior are confined to the structural challenges, the culture of university, lack of dept in relationships etc. Unlike other traditional resources for reaching the knowledge, i.e books, journals, individual notes, libraries, internet, to a certain extent, once it is distributed knowledge sharing become a students staff. Having said that knowledge means "power", holding knowledge is similar to holding competitive power of the new common understanding. The dilemma of knowledge sharing and hoarding happened in all students (Cheng, et al., 2009: 313). On the other hand, the benefits and challenges associated with knowledge sharing that students may face are noted and some recommendations for harnessing knowledge sharing practices to enhance satisfaction and increase student's success are offered. Nevertheless, knowledge exchange among collegian via face-to-face interactions should not be ignored as these essentially facilitate achieving desired outcomes of collective learning (Yuen and Majid, 2007:485). The student-to-student transmission of knowledge assists foster a culture of knowledge sharing within the university and is an essential means by which universities help create knowledge workers who can make a valuable contribution to the contemporary knowledge economy. In this regard, an ordinary framework for the

examination of other studies for knowledge sharing is shortly mentioned. In his paper Fischer-Appelt (1984) said that universities play a key role in the knowledge economy via their principal functions of transmitting and creating knowledge. In another study related to knowledge sharing among students says us universities create knowledge by way of research, and transfer it via teaching, collaboration and publication collaboration with government and industry (Fullwood, et al., 2013). Furthermore, the formalisation of knowledge sharing actions may be important to ensure that students obtain communication and teamwork skills that are crucial for success in the workplace (Gamlath and Wilson, 2017).

This study concentrates on knowledge sharing activities among university students. The purpose of this study is to identify the sense of desires or hoarding behaviors when other students need their knowledge, and also this paper finds out knowledge sharing practices among university students in Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University in Turkey. This paper is organized as follows: knowledge sharing among university students is described and following that methodology, findings and data analysis are discussed. The conclusion and limitations are also presented. The findings are expected to provide helpful insights for policy makers, administrators at academic institutions to manage and practice knowledge sharing among undergrads.

2. Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge could enhance its value when shared with others. Knowledge which is information whose feasibility has been founded by way of evidence (Liebeskind, 1999; Lee, 2000), has shown up as a strategically considerable source of the firm. In this direction, knowledge management becomes a fundamental factor to achieve and maintain a competitive priority. McDermott and O'Dell (2001) says that; Culture does play a significant role in the success of a knowledge management effort. According to them, they found a lot of samples where well-planned knowledge management materials and processes failed because people believed that they were already sharing pretty enough. In fact, your culture is stronger than your knowledge management approach. As a result, there is not only one right way to motivate people to share but various different roads depending on the type of the organization (McDermott and O'Dell, 2001: 77). Knowledge management contains the process of storage, capturing, using and sharing knowledge (Lee, 2000: 324). Knowledge sharing takes place when a person is eager to help as well as to learn from other persons in the development of more qualifications.

Knowledge sharing can be described as a social interaction culture, including the exchange of personnel knowledge, experiences, and skills through the whole department or organization. Samples of knowledge sharing contain personnel eagerness to correspond effectively with colleagues to illustrate donate knowledge, and intensely take colleague's advise to learn from them for example receive knowledge. Examples

also appear of how knowledge sharing happens at the individual and organizational levels. For individual personnel, knowledge sharing is speaking to colleagues to assist them get something done better, more understandable, more rapidly, or more actively. For an organization, knowledge sharing is grasping, editing, reutilize, and transference experience based on knowledge that dwells within the organization and making that knowledge available and accessible to others in the business. Knowledge sharing suggests an organization the possible for increased productivity as well as detention of ideational capital, even after personnels quit the organization, which is essential for business that builds value added (Lin, 2007: 137).

An essential factor in the successful collaborative learning is the active, willing and voluntarily sharing of information among students (Yuen and Majid, 2006:428). Such knowledge interchanges help students answer questions, solve problems, learn new things, get fast solutions, increase comprehension regarding a particular subject, or solely acts as a means to help one another (Högberg and Edvinsson, 1998: 82). These exchange could be in the shape of apparent knowledge (also known as information) which can be captured and documented, and the nonapparent knowledge in the form of skills and competencies. On the contrary information which is generally context-independent, unclear knowledge is personal and can only be shared through socialization, interaction, communication and training which often requires face-to-face contact, or in many cases, transferred via observation, falsification, practice, and interaction with the environment (Al-Hawamdeh, 2003).

3. Knowledge Sharing Barriers

The identification and realizing of knowledge sharing barriers, whether it be a natural part of a individual's culture or not, plays an important role in the success of students. Knowledge sharing practices frequently can be perceived fail because people could attempt to adjust their culture to fit their university culture or knowledge sharing targets and strategy, instead of implementing them so that they fit their culture. According to Riege (2005) knowledge sharing barriers are frequently related to factors such as lacking communication abilities and social networks, differences in national culture, mention lack of time and trust. There are many reasons why people hoard their knowledge and the contexts are often multi-dimensional. Just about almost every book written on knowledge management mentions on the distribution of the correct knowledge from the correct people to the correct people at the correct time being one of the biggest challenging knowledge sharing. Barriers result from personal behaviour or people's perceptions and activities can relate to either individuals or groups.

In literature, knowledge barriers appeared to have been accepted at least three different points:

1. Lack of knowledge about relevant subject depending on barriers for knowledge

sharing or transfer.

2. Not enough knowledge depending on level of education in a some area or about a particular topic.
3. The cognitive system in a particular human or group of humans does not involve enough contact points, or does not fit incoming information to benefit it and convert the information to knowledge.

These sights are not always easy to distinguish between and sometimes they can be appear more as a scale than being fixed group with clear limits. Depending on which aspect that is applied, important factors of how to “solve” knowledge barriers are implied (Paulin and Suneson, 2015:85).

It seems one mutual obstacle that conquers in all types of organizations is the “Knowledge is Power” mentality that outcomes in knowledge being regarded as an individual’s private asset and competitive advantage that makes a person unwilling to share information and results in “Information Hoarding” (Chaudhry, 2005). Droege and Hoobler (2003) emphasized that reciprocity together with trust encourage knowledge sharing. The lack of trust and faith are an important factors as it is the key to positive interpersonal relationships in a variety of circumstances which encourages knowledge sharing (Alstyne, 2005). Besides this, the deprivation of in depth relationship between the source and receiver of knowledge. Lack of motivation or awards to share (Smith and McKeen, 2003), Lack of time and not having of knowledge sharing culture in the learning environment are doubtto cut knowledge sharing among students.

University students are the most vital part of a society and the main driving force for future growth and development, we are aware of the Turkish government authorities emphasize the education system and educating the public and particularly university student for the future of the country. In doing so, university students are expected to utterly understand and appreciate the act of knowledge sharing in their learning life and improvement. For this reason, it would be reluctance and gripping to study the knowledge sharing patterns of university students. The targets of this study were to enlighten the common attitude of students towards knowledgesharing, conditions where knowledge is more likely to be shared, the communication lines preferred for knowledge exchange, and factors that prevent or motivate knowledge sharing among the college students. It is expected that this study would help contribute in improving a general opinion about the knowledge sharing attitude of university students, which will help educators choose appropriate learning approaches to encourage more interaction and knowledge sharing among students.

4. Methodology

The aim participants of this article were undergraduate students studying at faculty of Business Administration at Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University in Turkey. Since the

populations is large, convenience sampling is believed to be the most practicable method to be employed in this study. In view that this study attempts to explore the knowledge sharing patterns among undergraduate students. A questionnaire was used for soliciting responses and the survey instrument composed of two chapter and eight sections. The first chapter of the survey collected information about the respondents whereas the second chapter sought information related to the purposes approaches used for knowledge sharing. Including that chapter; general attitude towards knowledge sharing, preferred sources for study-related tasks, preferred channels for knowledge sharing and factors limiting knowledge sharing. The information about the paper was disseminated to the potential respondents by giving survey paper. The questionnaire was conducted KSU which is public university in Turkey and a total of 266 students participated in the study. The respondents represented business department. The participants constituted first grade students, second grade students, third grade students and fourth grade students from department of business at KSU.

5. Findings

Researchers carried out frequency and factor analyses as statistically. Frequency analysis made for shed light on the demographical features of participants as indicated Table I. To show factor analysis results Table II, III, IV, V, VI, VII and VIII were constituted which are explained factor those affecting knowledge sharing behavior among university students. As stated previously section of the paper, seven important areas have been the focus of this search which are considered suitable for the present study with 45 attributes measuring attitudes, preferred sources, frequency, types, channels, barriers and motivators of knowledge sharing. Detailed analyses results presented clearly at this section.

Table I: Demographic information about participants

Profile characteristics	Number	%
Gender		
Female	145	54.5
Male	121	45.5
Years of study		
Year 1	39	14.7
Year 2	91	34.2
Year 3	103	38.7
Year 4	33	12.4
Department of study		
Business	266	100
Time of education		
Daytime education	146	54.9
Evening education	120	45.1

Level of income

0-250 TRY	49	18.4
251-500 TRY	109	41.0
501-750 TRY	43	16.2
751-1000 TRY	22	8.3
1000 TRY and more	43	16.2

Number of children

Be an only child	7	2.6
Be two children	12	4.5
Be three children	51	19.2
Be four children	72	27.1
Be five children	68	25.6
Be six children and more	56	21.1

5.1 Demographic information about participants

The questionnaire involves demographic section. The section comprises of 8 questions designed to collect the respondents' demographic information. They include age, gender, year of study, department of study and time of education, hometown, level of income, number of children of family and grade point average. Table I indicates the respondents' profile.

As shown in Table I, female made up the majority of the students sampled with 54.5 per cent, and male made up the minority of the students sampled with 45.5 per cent. Students from year 1 made up sampled with 14.7 per cent followed by, students from year 2 made up sampled with 34.2 per cent. Most of the students sampled in year 3 with 38.7 per cent. Years 4 students only comprised of 27.1 per cent. Study was conducted through students from business of department therefore business' students constituted the total of participants. More than half of the attenders were noted from daytime education with 54.9 per cent and the rest of participants were from evening education with 45.1 per cent. Unfortunately, 18.4 per cent of the students said that they have a level of income between 0 TRY and 250 TRY. Other group was noted that in a level of income between 251 TRY and 500 TRY with 41.0 per cent, another group was noted that in a level of income between 501 TRY and 750 TRY with 16.2 per cent. Students in a level of income between 751 TRY and 1000 TRY made up least sample with 8.3 per cent, followed by in a level of income 1000 TRY and more sampled with 16.2 per cent of the students. It is interesting to note that only 2.6 per cent of the responders were an only child, followed by 4.5 per cent of the students stated that they have a family with two children. Growing in a family with three children students constituted 19.2 per cent of the participants. The majority of the students who have a family with four children made up with 27.1 per cent. Students were note that they have a family with five children with 25.6 per cent of the attenders. Lastly 21.1 per cent of the students made up that having a family six children and more.

5.2 General attitude towards knowledge sharing

The respondents were presented a mix of positive and negative statements for understanding their general attitude towards knowledge sharing. A big majority of the respondents 60.9 per cent “agreed” or “strongly agreed”, and 13.5 per cent of them “no opinion”, as the same rate of “disagreed”, and 12.0 per cent of the respondents “strongly disagreed” that sharing knowledge with peers would benefit all students. Another factor related to their opinion that knowledge should only be shared when approached by peers, 30.8 per cent of the respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” to this viewpoint, while 51.1 per cent of the participants either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with this aspect, also 18.0 per cent of respondents “no opinion” recorded. Although vast majority of the participants 72.2 per cent “agreed” or “strongly agreed”, other 15.4 per cent did not explain their opinion and 12.4 per cent “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that students should voluntarily share their knowledge with peers. The statement “sharing is caring” also yielded a somehow similar tendency where 71.4 per cent of the respondents either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with it but when we look at negative statements 16.1 per cent of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” and other 12.4 per cent did not clarify their opinion.

Table II: General attitude towards knowledge sharing

Perception	Number of Responses (%)				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I feel that it is important to share knowledge with other students for the benefit of all	88 (33.1)	74 (27.8)	36 (13.5)	36 (13.5)	32 (12.0)
Students should share knowledge with their peers only when approached	29 (10.9)	53 (19.9)	48 (18.0)	94 (35.3)	42 (15.8)
Students should voluntarily share their knowledge with peers	92 (34.6)	100 (37.6)	41 (15.4)	15 (5.6)	18 (6.8)
I feel that ‘sharing is caring’	83 (31.2)	107 (40.2)	33 (12.4)	23 (8.6)	20 (7.5)
It is better to avoid sharing information with peers whenever possible	19 (7.1)	21 (7.9)	44 (16.5)	77 (28.9)	105 (39.5)
Many students have the mindset that sharing knowledge is a type of plagiarism	32 (12.0)	64 (24.1)	55 (20.7)	58 (21.8)	57 (21.4)
Many students feel that they might be penalized by the lecturer for sharing information and knowledge	30 (11.3)	24 (9.0)	47 (17.7)	69 (25.9)	96 (36.1)

From another point of view, an overwhelming majority of the participants rejected three statements presenting knowledge sharing in the some negative context. Approximately 70.0 per cent of the respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” that knowledge sharing should be avoided whenever possible whereas only 15.0 per cent of the respondents declared their idea toward “agreed” or “strongly agreed” nearly same rate with “no opinion”. On the one hand, 43.2 per cent of the students rejected the question that information and knowledge sharing is a type of plagiarism, on the other hand, 36.1 per cent of them approved that question. In excess of 60.0 per cent of the respondents were recorded for the suggestion that many students do not share information and knowledge out of the fear that they might be penalized by their lecturers. It was encouraging to note that the respondents largely have possession of a positive attitude towards knowledge sharing and were awake of its importance in the learning process. Besides they rejected some misunderstanding associated with knowledge sharing which reflected their level of understanding and maturity.

Table III: Preferred sources for study-related tasks

Source	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Use the internet	3.81	1.17
Consult other fellow students	3.30	0.97
Use library resources to get more information on the topic	2.76	1.08
Consult the course professor/tutor	2.95	1.07
Consult friends outside the university	2.76	1.41

Scale: 1, least preferred; 5, most preferred

5.3 Preferred sources for study-related tasks

Result of students knowledge sharing preferences for study-related tasks is presented in Table III. The respondents were asked which sources they would rather, on a scale of 1-5, to consult while searching information on certain study-related tasks. The aim was to bring out their probability of approaching their fellow friends for getting the needed information. As indicated in Table III, it is clear that, 3.81 mean score of the respondents explained that internet is the most preferred source for students, while consulting other fellow students are among the more preferred sources by the university students in seeking for knowledge mean score 3.30. It is within expectation to see that students viewed professor/tutor resources as one of the more preferred sources of knowledge for study-related tasks mean score 2.95. Finally, Table III shows two statements that using the library resources and consulting friends from outside their university were the same results on preferred source for knowledge mean score 2.76. It seemed that students noticed the fact that their peers, conceivably owing to common understanding of the task, were one of the most useful sources in getting study-related information and knowledge.

Table IV: Preferred channels for knowledge sharing

Communication channel	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Face to face	3.83	0.99
Internet (Skype, MSN, Messenger etc.)	3.84	0.94
Email	2.26	1.16
Telephone	4.00	1.02
Online message board	2.15	1.24

5.4 Preferred channels for knowledge sharing

As illustrate in Table IV, it was reached that telephone communication channel was the most preferred form of sharing knowledge mean score 4.00, followed by internet mean score 3.84. As indicated in Table IV, university students preferred mean score 3.83 in face-to-face interaction. However it is interesting to note that university students used email mean score 2.26. Finally the least preferred channel for knowledge sharing was the online message board mean score 2.15. The proliferation of other communication channels which could sufficiently meet the students’s need could also be a factor that rendered the diminished use of the online message board. The telephone communication channel was probably preferred because it provides free chatting, sharing relevant links, instant feedback.

Table V: Factors limiting knowledge sharing

Reason	Number of Responses (%)				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Lack of depth in relationship	81 (30.5)	90 (33.8)	37 (13.9)	31 (11.7)	27 (10.2)
Afraid taht others would perform better	39 (14.7)	45 (16.9)	55 (20.7)	90 (33.8)	37 (13.9)
People only share with those who share with them	44 (16.5)	87 (32.7)	69 (25.9)	42 (15.8)	23 (8.6)
Do not want to be perceived as a "show-off"	28 (10.5)	79 (29.7)	57 (21.4)	59 (22.2)	43 (16.2)
Afraid to provide the wrong information	31 (11.7)	84 (31.6)	79 (29.7)	44 (16.5)	28 (10.5)
Lack of knowledge-sharing culture	30 (11.3)	77 (28.9)	78 (29.3)	55 (20.7)	26 (9.8)
Shy to provide own opinions	32 (12.0)	57 (21.4)	67 (25.2)	63 (23.7)	47 (17.7)
Lack of time	25 (9.4)	78 (29.3)	76 (28.6)	57 (21.4)	30 (11.3)
Lack of appreciation of knowledge sharing	32 (12.0)	61 (22.9)	79 (29.7)	61 (22.9)	33 (12.4)
Afraid that an opinion mismatch would offend others	31 (11.7)	45 (16.9)	79 (29.7)	70 (26.3)	40 (15.0)
Do not know what to share	29 (10.9)	49 (18.4)	77 (28.9)	63 (23.7)	48 (18.0)

5.5 Factors inhibiting knowledge sharing

Table V, shows the 11 possible reasons preventative knowledge sharing among students in KSU. The respondents were asked to indicate the possible factors in their opinion, pose hurdles in active knowledge sharing by their fellow students. A big majority 64.3 per cent of the respondents felt that it was due to lack of depth in relationship between students, other 21.9 per cent of the respondents either do not “agree” or “strongly disagree”, there is a 13.9 per cent of the respondents had “no opinion” for this statement. An interesting findings was where 33.8 per cent of the participants felt that their classmates do not share knowledge with peers because they fear these students would perform better from them while 31.2 per cent of them felt that classmates share knowledge with peers. Other barriers to knowledge sharing, as identified by the 49.2 per cent of the respondents, were the lack of reciprocity in sharing and 25.9 per cent of the students felt nothing. Among the students 40.2 per cent of the respondents felt apprehensive to be perceived as a show-off, on the other hand, 38.4 per cent of the respondents had not apprehension about to be perceived show-off, remained 21.4 per cent of respondents had no opinion. The students were asked the fear of providing wrong information 43.3 per cent of the respondents implied either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” remarked but 27.0 per cent among them notified negative state. Clearly demonstrating in the table V 40.2 per cent of the respondents felt positive to the lack of knowledge sharing culture, 29.3 per cent of participants had no idea and the rest of respondents felt negative for this statement. Among the respondents 33.4 per cent felt shy when provide their own opinions. The statement “lack of time” also yielded tendency where 38.7 per cent of the respondents either “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with it but when we look at negative statements 32.7 per cent of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” and interestingly 28.6 per cent did not assert any opinion. When the respondents were asked that lack of appreciation of knowledge sharing as a type of factor inhibiting approximately 34.9 per cent of the respondents stated “agreed” or “strongly agreed”, 29.7 per cent of the respondents said “no opinion”, and 35.3 per cent of the respondents stated their view either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” as shown in Table V. It is seem that 16.9 per cent of the students afraid that their opinion mismatch would offend others whereas 26.3 per cent of them do not agree with that statement. The last inhibiting factor was asked to students about 40.0 per cent of the students explained they do not know what to share, on the other hand, 41.7 per cent of the students supported negative opinion the rest of participant had no opinion for this statement. It seemed that with a high degree of probability lack of depth in relationship and the pressure to outperform others, as well as certain other fears, were hindering active knowledge sharing among students.

6. Conclusion

In the current times, the frequent references in the knowledge management literature to terms like knowledge organisation, knowledge worker, knowledge economy and knowledge sharing is proof of the crucial role that knowledge plays in all aspects of modern society. The importance of knowledge sharing between students is investigated by many academicians in many studies in many countries until this time. Efficient and voluntarily sharing of knowledge is a fundamental element of effective and meaningful at the learning. "Effective knowledge sharing can not be forced or mandated" (Bock, et al., 2005). As many students are expected to join the workforce after their undergraduate studies, a positive manner towards knowledge sharing would make students more fertile to their employing organizations. In other respects if their reluctance to share information and knowledge with peers during university years is left unchecked, it is presumably that this manner would become piece of their personality and they will maintain exhibiting the same mentality at their work place.

This study was conducted to examine knowledge sharing among university students. Our research has identified several factors that affecting knowledge sharing which are general attitude towards knowledge sharing, preferred sources for study-related tasks, preferred channels for knowledge sharing, factors limiting knowledge sharing. This research is based on statistical analysis such as frequency to explain how knowledge substructure is able to shape knowledge sharing attitude.

In our research, male constituted more than half part of participants, we collected students from business of department and each year of university life. Both daytime and evening time educated students are existed in the research. Finally students from large level of income and different number of children in family participated.

The respondents were presented both positive and negative statements for general attitude towards knowledge sharing even though positive ideas were mainly observed. Majority of the participants were of the same mind that students should voluntarily share their knowledge with peers and in their opinion "sharing is caring". Similarly in Yuen and Majid's results (2006) students rejected negative context such as knowledge sharing should be avoided or information and knowledge sharing is a type of plagiarism. As a negative statement they supported it is better to avoid sharing information with peers. It was interesting to note that the participants of this study valued their peers as an important resource of knowledge and, on the whole, demonstrated a positive attitude towards information and knowledge sharing.

The aim was to bring out that source which are preferred the most while sharing knowledge. As shown in section of analyses, our results revealed "internet" as a preferred source for study-related tasks. According to a current study related to knowledge sharing, Yaghi et al (2011) in their conductive paper supportively demonstrates that most of the student's idea that knowledge sharing via sharing power

point slides, lecture notes and other learning resources among students would benefit all and university culture does not supply adequate support for sharing knowledge.

Findings show that, respondents stated that often knowledge sharing is through expressing opinions on certain study-related matters. Wei et al (2012)'s findings show that students from both public university and private university share URL's of relevant web sites with their peers. Consequently, in both paper demonstrated that even students preferred different types of information and knowledge sharing in general, students support sharing.

Obtained as the most preferred form of sharing knowledge is interestingly telephone in our result. However in their paper Yuen and Majid's (2006) found that face-to-face communication was the most preferred form of knowledge sharing. In a way that supports them, Wei et al (2011) concluded the same result.

A lack of depth in peer relationship and the pressure to outperform classmates academically were the two essential factors that inhibited knowledge sharing with reference to our results. Another study concerning this issue, McDermott and O'Dell (2001) stated that overcoming "cultural barriers" to share knowledge has more to do with how you form and practice your knowledge management effort than with changing your culture.

As common trust and respect are noted important in knowledge sharing, academic foundations should make efforts to foster sincere relationship among students by means of providing abundant interaction opportunities through organizing informal social event. Droege and Hoobler (2003) emphasized that reciprocity together with trust encourage knowledge sharing. The lack of trust and faith are an important factors as it is the key to positive interpersonal relationships in a variety of circumstances which encourages knowledge sharing (Alstynne, 2005). Besides this, the deprivation of relationship between the source and receiver of knowledge. Lack of motivation or awards to share (Smith and McKeen, 2003), Lack of time and not having of knowledge sharing culture in the learning environment might cut knowledge sharing among students.

On the whole, our result suggests that each approach, tool, method should be considered to improve lifelong sharer behavior, which in turn can play an important role in the knowledge sharing in universities. As shown in this study, knowledge sharing perceptions of students at universities play crucial role in all success and progress. Furthermore, this important behavior goes on during career even until end of the life. The findings of this study provide support for the previous theoretical and empirical studies in the literature in addition to this, we hope that future researches in the way of science will be enlightened.

References

- Al-Hawamdeh, S. (2003). Knowledge management: cultivating knowledge professionals. Elsevier.
- Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., & Lee, J. N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS quarterly*, 87-111.
- Chaudhry, A. B. (2005). Knowledge sharing practices in Asian institutions: a multi-cultural perspective from Singapore. IFLA 2005.
- Cheng, M. Y., Ho, J. S. Y., & Lau, P. M. (2009). Knowledge sharing in academic institutions: A study of multimedia university Malaysia. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(3).
- Chin Wei, C., Siong Choy, C., Geok Chew, G., & Yee Yen, Y. (2012). Knowledge sharing patterns of undergraduate students. *Library Review*, 61(5), 327-344.
- Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management science*, 50(3), 352-364.
- Droege, S. B., & Hoobler, J. M. (2003). Employee turnover and tacit knowledge diffusion: A network perspective. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 50-64.
- Emmer, E. T., & Gerwels, M. C. (2002). Cooperative learning in elementary classrooms: Teaching practices and lesson characteristics. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103(1), 75-91.
- Fischer-Appelt, P. (1984). The basic functions of the modern university. *Higher Education in Europe*, 9(4), 6-10.
- Fullwood, R., Rowley, J., & Delbridge, R. (2013). Knowledge sharing amongst academics in UK universities. *Journal of knowledge management*, 17(1), 123-136.
- Gamlath, S., & Wilson, T. (2017). Knowledge Sharing among University Students: A Review of Current Practices.
- Gupta, AK and V Govindarajan (2000). Knowledge management's social dimension: Lessons from Nucor steel. *Sloan Management Review*, 42(1), 71-80.
- Högberg, C., & Edvinsson, L. (1998). A design for futurizing knowledge networking. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 2(2), 81-92.
- Jackson, S. E., DeNisi, A., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Managing knowledge for sustained competitive advantage: Designing strategies for effective human resource management* (Vol. 21). John Wiley & Sons.
- Jer Yuen, T., & Shaheen Majid, M. (2007). Knowledge-sharing patterns of undergraduate students in Singapore. *Library Review*, 56(6), 485-494.
- Lee, J. N. (2001). The impact of knowledge sharing, organizational capability and partnership quality on IS outsourcing success. *Information & Management*, 38(5), 323-335.
- Liebeskind, J. P. (1999). Knowledge, strategy, and the theory of the firm. In *Knowledge and strategy* (pp. 197-219).
- Lin, H. F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of information science*, 33(2), 135-149.
- McDermott, R., & O'dell, C. (2001). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. *Journal of knowledge management*, 5(1), 76-85.
- McDermott, R., & O'dell, C. (2001). Overcoming cultural barriers to sharing knowledge. *Journal of knowledge management*, 5(1), 76-85.

- McShannon, J. R. (2000). Interactive learning styles of undergraduate engineering students in New Mexico: A new model.
- Mills, D. W. (2002). Applying what we know: Student learning styles. Retrieved April, 7, 2009.
- Paulin, D., & Suneson, K. (2015). Knowledge transfer, knowledge sharing and knowledge barriers—three blurry terms in KM. *Leading Issues in Knowledge Management, Volume Two, 2*, 73-94.
- Riege, A. (2005). Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of knowledge management, 9*(3), 18-35.
- Szulanski, G., Cappetta, R., & Jensen, R. J. (2004). When and how trustworthiness matters: Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity. *Organizationscience, 15*(5), 600-613.
- Van Alstyne, M. W. (2005). Create colleagues, not competitors. *Harvard Business Review, 83*(9), 24-28.
- Walker, J. W. (2002). Research, knowledge sharing, and you.(Perspectives). *Human Resource Planning, 25*(2), 10-13.
- Yaghi, K., Barakat, S., Alfawaer, Z. M., Shkokani, M., & Nassuora, A. (2011). Knowledge sharing degree among the undergraduate students: a case study at applied science private university. *International Journal of Academic Research, 3*(1), 20-24.