

The Effects of Relational Social Capital and Technological Factors on Knowledge Sharing in an Online Community

Sri Hesti^a, ^aSchool of Communication, Universitas Mercu Buana, Email: sri.hesti@mercubuana.ac.id

This research aims to investigate the factors that affect the process of knowledge sharing in an online community known as Indonesian Backpacker. The variables that are considered in the present study include relational social capital, technological factors, and knowledge sharing processes. The research method used in this research is a quantitative survey. The main results of this research revealed that the relational social capital and technological factors tend to affect the process of knowledge sharing among the Indonesian Backpacker online community. Moreover, it should be noted that technological factors have a more significant effect on the process of knowledge sharing compared to relational social capital. In addition, the current research discovered that a sense of interconnection between community members as well as the adequacy of knowledge on the site is considered as the main factors in the collaboration of building shared knowledge. In other words, it should be understood that knowledge among community members is commonly interpreted, understood, and implemented. In this case, the knowledge will be shared again through the site as a new form of knowledge after completing the enrichment process.

Keywords: *Relational social capital, technological factors, knowledge sharing process*

Introduction

Today is the era of knowledge-based society (Nonaka & Toyama, 2015). Knowledge itself is a high-value resource in market, products, technology, competitors, laws and regulations as well as the society that is rapidly changing. Hence, it is important to note that companies which are equipped with an in-depth knowledge of consumers will be able to appropriately design

marketing communication strategies in overcoming possible business competition (Hsu, 2011; Rekarti & Doktoralina, 2017).

Furthermore, knowledge will only become our asset if it is not distributed to other individuals who are capable of exploring and putting them for further use. Davenport and Prusak (1998) conducted the first study on knowledge sharing in the sphere of formal organisations. Furthermore, discussion on knowledge sharing has been attracting considerable interest as a result of the development of communication and information technology, mainly due to the emergence of the Internet. In addition, it should be understood that this does not only revolve around the scope of formal organisations but also the informal ones, regardless of whether they share the same interest (community of interest) or communities of practitioners as a whole (Charband & Jafari Navimipour, 2018).

On another note, it is crucial to understand that knowledge sharing through online media is not easy. Accordingly, this has led to a number of advantages which are described as follows: (1) barriers to technology use (Charband & Jafari Navimipour, 2018); and (2) lack of knowledge for knowledge sharing among the members (Faraj & Wasko, 2001), lack of time to share knowledge (Gray, 2004), the difficulty of identifying themselves in the sphere of their community (Gray, 2004), the confidentiality of information (Fang & Chiu, 2010), trust factors (Chung, Cooke, Fry, & Hung, 2015), and individual factors (Faraj & Wasko, 2001; Hsu, 2011).

Interestingly, it should be noted that members of the online community are allowed to come and go, their existence and presence are not easily identified, and they are not obliged to remain in the online community (Charband & Jafari Navimipour, 2018). Therefore, this further suggests that face-to-face interaction is more powerful compared to the use of online media (Charband & Navimipour, 2016)

Regarding this matter, past research found that the willingness of the members of the online community to share their knowledge has led to the increasing occurrence of knowledge sharing, which further motivates them to be more than just members. More specifically, a considerable amount of research on knowledge sharing and online communities has been carried out in many countries (Jadin, Gnams, & Batinic, 2013). Accordingly, the followings are past research conducted in this field: the participatory research on the practices of knowledge building in Wikipedia (Hichang, Chen, & Chung, 2010); the role of social media in the improvement of communication and knowledge sharing (Ellison, Gibbs, & Weber, 2015); relational social capital in the process of the division of knowledge in an online community (Dalziel, Gentry, & Bowerman, 2011); individual and community factors that affect the process of knowledge sharing in an open-source software community (Chung et al., 2015); the role of trust in knowledge sharing in virtual communities carried out with the samples spread in America,

United Kingdom, Australia, Switzerland, Spain, Denmark, and India (Ellison et al., 2015); the factors that affect the quality of technology knowledge sharing (Nonaka & Toyama, 2015); and the factors that affect employees who share knowledge using social media (Jadin et al., 2013).

According to Srivastava and Banaji (2011), relational social capital is the first factor that affects community members who are willing to share their knowledge which is described as a personal relationship developed between people through interaction history. In this case, it is important to note that shared history is able to bring social capital forward in the community, and eventually support its members to be more incorporated in the community and increase their willingness to share their knowledge. The second factor is related to technology which plays a critical role in this matter due to its ability in increasing the level of knowledge sharing (Dalziel et al., 2011). Technology is utilised as communication media in the context of knowledge sharing, which is mainly resulted by the TKI development. Therefore, the existing problems and the findings provided by past research have motivated the present study to measure relational social capital factors and technology factors towards the process of knowledge sharing in the online communities of "Backpacker Indonesia" (BPI).

BPI is an online travellers community with a total membership of 38,118 with the majority of individuals from Indonesia (www.backpackerindonesia.com, November 16, 2013, at 16.27 Western Indonesian Time). The purpose of knowledge sharing activities in the community of BPI is to share knowledge about a series of tourism products. According to Seaton and Bennett (2004), tourism products can be described as products that have high diversity, require high involvement in the selection process, and pose a high degree of risk for the travellers (Wang & Pizam, 2011), particularly in terms of money, time, success, security, and others (Wang & Pizam, 2011). Nevertheless, it has become a norm for a lot of travellers to devise their trip plans independently and subsequently order their personalised travel packages (Dwityas & Briandana, 2017; Sutono, Briandana, Doktoralina, Rekarti, & Dwityas, 2018).

Therefore, this has encouraged the current research to investigate the effects of relational social capital and technological factors on the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of "Backpacker Indonesia".

Literature Review

Relational Social Capital

The relational social capital selected for the current research is based on the study conducted by Wasko and Faraj (2008) which stated that the relational social capital with the weight point of interaction and interaction history might be able to explain the occurrence of knowledge

sharing on the network. Meanwhile, other similar researches were also conducted by Iskoujina (2010) and Hichang et al. (2010).

On a more important note, the relational social capital can be further discovered and measured based on four dimensions as follows: (1) obligations, (2) the norm, (3) trust, and (4) identification (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In this case, an obligation which acts as the first dimension is defined as a set of commitments, rights, and obligations of the community members (Wasko & Faraj, 2008). Next, the norm as the second dimension refers to the standard of acceptance that directs and regulates collective life, followed by the third dimension known as a trust which indicates the willingness to be sensitive to others based on the belief that others can be trusted, open, honest, empathetic, and competent (Wasko & Faraj, 2008). Finally, the fourth dimension, which is the identification, refers to the process whereby individuals tend to see themselves being incorporated with others or a group of people (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998).

Therefore, this leads to the first hypothesis of the current research described as follows: the relational social capital affects the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of "Backpacker Indonesia".

Communication Technology Factors

According to McLuhan (1994), communication technology is described as communication media which has led to the emergence of new methods of knowledge sharing (Vaishnavi & Kuechler, 2015). Regarding this matter, Jadin et al. (2013) stated that the main focus is the medium that can facilitate people to make conversation, build communities, and establish identity such as the computers with internet accessor known as the new media.

The new media has been undergoing continuous development which starts from the static Web 1.0 site, followed by the inception of Web 2.0 with the interactive-based facilities which allow users to share content (Dwityas & Briandana, 2017). Specifically, it is pointed out that the interactive features of Web 2.0 are able to facilitate users to be more selective when choosing source information and interacting with others, modifying site pages, uploading opinions and comments, making collaboration by following online conversation as well as sharing content by uploading texts, images, videos, or audios (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).

Therefore, it should be noted that one of the Web 2.0 based applications is social media which is an online platform and media applications that aim at facilitating interaction, collaboration, and content sharing (Button, Harrington, & Belan, 2014). Furthermore, social networking is a feature of social media that can accommodate several social functions of other features to enable more accessible communication among users. In this case, communication content can

be messages of self-expression, documentation, comments, participation in community forums, and knowledge search (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).

On another note, the measurement of communication technology usage had been established by previous researches of Ismail and Yusof (2010) and Wahlroos (2011). Overall, the dimensions that lead to the development of communications technology factors are considered as the facilitation for the need of knowledge and convenience facilities. Regarding this matter, this observation may support the second hypothesis of the current research as follows: technology factors affect the process of knowledge sharing.

Process of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing is a communication process that occurs between two or more individuals with the characteristics of explicit or tacit knowledge exchange, which collectively creates new knowledge in the social context of the activities (Bock, Zmud, Kim, & Lee, 2005; Chow & Chan, 2008). Moreover, the socialisation, externalisation, combination and internalisation models (SECI) developed by Nonaka (2008) has been widely utilised for the process of knowledge sharing in the context of building new knowledge. Christou (2016) adopted the SECI model for the implementation of knowledge sharing process on new media.

As argued by Nonaka (2008), explicit knowledge is described as written and encrypted knowledge, while tacit knowledge refers to knowledge that resides in the mind of individuals. Meanwhile, Kiesler (2014) stated that individuals might have different tendencies to share their explicit or implicit knowledge. Moreover, it should be understood that tacit knowledge can be converted into explicit knowledge. Therefore, knowledge sharing can be considered as a conversion or externalisation of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge (Bock et al., 2005; Chow & Chan, 2008).

On a more important note, the process of knowledge sharing on new media consists of four dimensions, namely socialisation, externalisation, combination, and internalisation. First, socialisation is described as a process of converting tacit to tacit knowledge. The second dimension is the externalisation which is defined as the knowledge conversion process from tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge. Next, the third dimension is known as a combination that refers to the conversion of precise into explicit knowledge, followed by the fourth dimension known as internalisation which involves the conversion of tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge.

Relational Social Capital and Technology Factors in the Process of Knowledge Sharing

Social relational capital is built based on interaction history among community members. Accordingly, communication technology that occurs on social media has provided a platform for individuals to make online interaction and build interaction history together, which leads to further knowledge sharing in the community.

A considerable amount of past research (Hichang et al., 2010; Iskoujina, 2010; Wasko & Faraj, 2008) stated that relational social capital and technological factors are partially known to have a positive and significant relationship as well as the limited effect on the process of knowledge sharing. Hence, this matter needs to be proven further simultaneously. Therefore, the current research aims to simultaneously identify which relational social capital and technology factors that affect the process of knowledge sharing. Thus, the following which acts as the third hypothesis conceivably hypothesise that: the relational social capital, together with technological factors, affect the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of "Backpacker Indonesia".

Research Methods

The research used a quantitative study approach to measure the effects of relational social capital and technology factors on knowledge sharing. The survey methods were conducted among the online community members of BPI, which amounted to a total of 38,118 individuals. In addition, a sampling technique was carried out randomly (or also known as random sampling) using the calculation technique developed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), i.e. $50 + \sqrt{N}$. In the case of the current research, the calculation results revealed that the minimal total samples were 66 samples, while the data collection results showed that the total number of respondents amounted to 169 individuals. Hence, this indicates that the number of samples employed by the current research exceeded the minimum amount required by the research approach.

Furthermore, the data collection process of the present study consisted of two stages. In the first stage, the online community members of BPI were digitally invited to answer the questionnaire developed on the website of Backpackers Indonesia. Meanwhile, the second phase involved the process of re-inviting online community members who failed to participate in the survey research via email and private messages on the online community sites of BPI. Moreover, a *t*-test was conducted among the respondents to avoid bias. In this case, the test results found that the level of significance (Sig (2-tailed)) was above 0.05 for the data achieved in the first and second stages. Hence, this indicated that there was no significant difference in the answers provided by the respondents for the two groups of samples given. Therefore, this suggests that the data used in the current research can explain the research conclusion.

The research instrument adopted in the present study was constructed using three variables, namely relational social capital, technology factors, and the process of knowledge sharing. The first variable which is relational social capital (X_1) consisted of a total of 23 item indicators described as follows: (1) I feel obliged to participate in the online community; (2) I feel responsible to help friends in the online community; (3) I am ready to obey the existing rules of the online community; (4) I feel that the members expect me to keep participating in the online community; (5) I know that there are norms in the online community; (6) I know that there are rules established by the online community; (7) I am aware that there is a guideline of the right to behave in the online community; (8) I know that the interaction among the community members is ruled in norms; (9) I realise that the Community Managers tend to expect that all community members will interact appropriately in accordance to the existing norms; (10) I believe that knowledge on tourism activities provided by the community members can be trusted; (11) I believe that knowledge about tourism activities provided by the community members is accurate; (12) I believe that knowledge about tourism activities provided by the community members is qualified; (13) I believe that trust among fellow members of the online community will encourage more concern through the sharing of technical matters related to tourism activities that may be encountered; (14) I believe that fellow members of the online community will actively provide positive response when technical matters regarding tourism activities are shared to other fellow members; (15) I believe that the community members will provide the best assistance; (16) I believe that the community members have high commitment; (17) I believe that the community members are trustable; (18) I believe that the community members help each other sincerely; (19) I feel that there is a mutual understanding regarding each other's needs; (20) I feel that knowledge sharing is related to the needs of the community members; (21) I feel that it is associated to the willingness of fellow members of the online community; (22) I feel that there is no loss if I do not participate in the online community; and (23) I have a strong bond with the online community of BPI.

The second variable refers to the technology factors (X_2) with the total indicators of seven items which are described as follows: (1) The online community site facilitates the necessary knowledge for tourism activities; (2) I am able to quickly find the knowledge of tourism activities when I run a search on the online community site; (3) The latest knowledge about tourism activities can be found on the website of the online community; (4) There are various facilities provided on the site; (5) The facilities available on the site are not easy to use; (6) I have no ability to utilise the existing facilities on the site; and (7) I have no skill in utilising the existing facilities on the site.

The third variable refers to the process of knowledge sharing (Y) with the total indicators of 12 items listed as follows: (1) I participate in the discussions about tourism activities on the online forum community; (2) I update my profile on the site; (3) I distribute knowledge on the site; (4) I do markings on the knowledge that I find on the site; (5) I actively make comments

in the discussions that take place in the online forum; (6) I learn to make travel plans with the knowledge I gain from the online community; (7) I make tourism travelling plans with the knowledge I gain from the online community; (8) I like to take down information that I read on the site; (9) I write back the knowledge I understand about tourism activities after I read related documents available on the site; (10) I write back what I understood about tourism activities from various discussions carried out on the discussion forums; (11) I build knowledge sharing about tourism activities together with other community members; and (12) I upload the knowledge about tourism activities available on the site.

The results of test validity and reliability carried out in the first stage showed that one item (item no. 10) in relational social capital was invalid. Meanwhile, all twenty-two indicators of the relational social capital variable were expressed valid with the value of r Product Moment > 0.361 and significance < 0.05 after the second test was conducted. On the other hand, the next test was carried out to test the variable of technology factors as well as the process of knowledge sharing. Regarding this matter, it should be noted that the test for both variables was only conducted once in the current research because the test results for all questions managed to fulfil the values of the r Product Moment > 0.361 and obtained a significance of 0.05 , thus further declaring that all points were valid.

Furthermore, the reliability test results showed that the relational social capital variable obtained a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.910 , which was higher than 0.60 . Hence, this indicated that the relational social capital variable was reliable. On another note, the variable of technology factors obtained a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.858 , which was also higher than 0.60 , thus indicating that the variable of the technology factors was reliable. The final variable was the process of knowledge sharing, which achieved a Cronbach Alpha of 0.871 , which was higher than 0.60 ; hence, this indicates that the variable of knowledge sharing was also reliable.

The validity test of the second phase was conducted to find out the degree of validity for each point of the questions employed by the research instrument (the questionnaire) which was answered by a total of 169 respondents. In this case, the value of the r Product Moment (critical value) amounted to 0.150 with a significance level of 5% managed to be achieved with the total samples of 169 respondents ($df = n-2$). Meanwhile, the relational social capital variable was also declared valid with the value of each r Product Moment of > 0.151 and the significance level of < 0.05 . Similarly, the variable of technology factors was declared valid with the value of each r Product Moment of > 0.151 and the significance level of < 0.05 . On another note, the variable for the process of knowledge sharing was declared valid as it managed to obtain the value of > 0.151 for each r Product Moment with the significance level of < 0.05 . Apart from that, the relational social capital variable was declared reliable based on the results of the reliability test with the Cronbach Alpha value of 0.821 , which exceeded 0.60 . Next, the variable of the technology factors obtained a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.706 , which exceeded

0.60 which led it to be declared reliable. Finally, the variable for the process of knowledge sharing had a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.772, which was also above 0.60, thus causing it to be declared reliable.

In this case, the findings showed that the research data had a normal distribution because the normal value of the sig X_1 was $0.444 > 0.05$, the value of sig. X_2 was $0.184 > 0.05$, and the value of sig. Y was $0.380 > 0.05$. Moreover, the summary of the linearity test results found a linear relationship between the variables X_1 and Y as well as X_2 and Y. Meanwhile, the value of sig linearity data for the X_1 and Y was 0.00 (smaller than 0.05), followed by the deviation value from linearity of 0.296 (exceeds 0.05). In addition, it occurred to the value of the sig linearity data for the variables X_2 and Y, such as 0.00 (smaller than 0.05) as well as the Sig. deviation value of 0.976 from linearity (greater than 0.05). On another note, no independent variable with the tolerance value of ≤ 0.10 was found from the multicollinearity test, which indicated that there was no correlation between independent variables because the value exceeded 95%. Meanwhile, there were no independent variables with the VIF value of ≥ 10 . Therefore, it can be concluded that there was no multicollinearity between independent variables in the current research.

Meanwhile, factor analysis was conducted for the variable of technology factors by utilising the rotation factor to explain the variables that entered in certain factors. In this case, it was divided into two factors despite the seven indicators analysed by the computer-extracted results. The first factor explained 38.6% of the variation, while the second factor only explained by 19.4%. In other words, both of these factors were capable of explaining 50% of the variation. Furthermore, there were two groups of factors in the view of the varimax rotated component matrix, whereas there were only five indicators that had the loading factor of > 0.70 . Moreover, it should be noted that the first factor was related to the content of the site; hence, it was called "the site content" consisting of the followings: (1) online community site of BPI facilitates the knowledge need for tourism activities; (2) knowledge of tourism activities can be found quickly on the online community website of BPI; and (3) latest knowledge about tourism activities can be found on the online community website of BPI. Meanwhile, the second factor was related to the use of the facilities that the provided by BPI website which was named as "convenience facility" that comprises of (1) facilities are available on the BPI website and easy to use, and (2) community members have the skills in utilising the existing facilities on BPI website. Overall, the indicators of technology factors were reduced initially from seven items to five items based on the analysis results of the factors.

Results and Discussion

Results

Table 1 presents the results of correlation and regression analysis that were conducted to answer hypothesis I, II, and III which involved testing the effects of independent variables (X_1 and X_2) on the dependent variable (Y), either partially or simultaneously.

Table 1: Correlation and Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	Pearson's Correlation (r)	Adjusted R Square	Coefficients		t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error		
Relational Social Capital (X_1)	0.496	.241	13.305	3.949	4.157	.000
Technology Factors (X_2)	0.561	.310	19.554	2.625	5.963	.000
Dependent Variable	Process of Knowledge Sharing					
R2	,371					
F	50.650			Sig.		.000b

Source: Processed from primary data

The First Hypothesis: Relational Social Capital Affects the Process of Knowledge Sharing In the Online Community of Backpackers Indonesia

The results of the correlation test revealed that there was a positive and significant relationship between relational social capital (X_1) and the process of knowledge sharing (Y) with the power relationship of 0.496 (the correlation level of "medium"). Meanwhile, for the regression test results for relational social capital towards the process of knowledge sharing obtained 24.1% for the contribution of X_1 to Y, while the remaining 75.9% were affected by other factors. On the note of the coefficient factor, the increase of relational social capital leads to a higher occurrence of knowledge sharing process in the online community of "Backpackers Indonesia". On another note, the test of significance level obtained a value $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$, which indicated that H_0 was denied, while H_a was received.

Second Hypothesis: Technology Factors Affect the Process of Knowledge Sharing in the Online Community of Backpacker Indonesia

A positive and significant relationship was found between the technology factors (X_2) and the process of knowledge sharing (Y) with the power relationship of 0.561 (the correlation level of "medium") based on the results of correlation test. On another note, the results of the regression test between the technological factors and the process of knowledge sharing obtained 31% of the contribution of X_2 to Y, whereas the remaining of 69% were affected by other factors. Regarding the coefficient factor, a significant increase in the technology factor will encourage the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of Backpackers Indonesia. Apart from that, the test of the significance level showed that the value of $t_{hitung} > t_{tabel}$ was $1.974 > 8.750$, which suggested that H_0 was denied, while H_a was received.

The Third Hypothesis: Relational Social Capital and Technology Factors Simultaneously Affect the Process of Knowledge Sharing in the Online Community of Backpacker Indonesia

Multiple regression test was carried out to investigate the effects of relational social capital (X_1) and technology factors (X_2) on the process of knowledge sharing (Y). In this case, the test results obtained 37.1% for the contribution of X_1 and X_2 towards Y, while the remaining of 62.9% were affected by other factors. Other than that, the simultaneous significance tests (F) were carried out to demonstrate whether relational social capital and technology factors simultaneously affect the process of knowledge sharing. According to the results of the F test, it was found that the value of the F_{hitung} and F_{tabel} was 50.650 and 3.05, respectively. Therefore, the F_{hitung} value of 50.650 $>$ the F_{tabel} value of 3.05 with the significance level of $0.000 < 0.05$, which indicated that H_0 was denied, while H_a was received.

Discussion

Relational Social Capital and the Process of Knowledge Sharing in the Online Community of Backpacker Indonesia

The first hypothesis proposed in the current research hypothesised that "relational social capital affects the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of Backpackers Indonesia". In this case, a significant effect of relational social capital towards the process of knowledge sharing was found based on the results of the statistical test, which further indicates that the hypothesis is acceptable.

The research results are in line with the results of previous research conducted by Wasko & Faraj (2008) despite the lower level of contributions and closeness of the relationship between relational social capital and the process of knowledge sharing obtained by the current research. Nevertheless, it should be understood that positive response with a high category for the variable of relational social capital on the online community members of BPI may not be able to adequately generate a high correlation, particularly when relational social capital is

correlated to the process of knowledge sharing. In addition, it prevails the contribution of relational social capital towards the process of knowledge sharing.

A further analysis was conducted by looking at the relationship between the dimension of relational social capital and the process of knowledge sharing. The results showed no significant relationship or close relationship between the dimension of the norm and externalisation as well as combination and internalisation for the variable in the process of knowledge sharing. Furthermore, it is crucial to note that the results of the present study on the dimension of the norm are not in agreement with previous research that demonstrated a significant relationship between norms and the process of knowledge sharing (Wasko & Faraj, 2008).

Regarding this matter, it is appropriate to understand that norms are described as the acceptance standards that direct and regulate collective life. Other than that, acceptance standards refer to the level of agreements that reflect societal values (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998), while the existence of norms support the occurrence of cooperation in the groups (Hichang et al., 2010). According to Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), not all norms in the community have a positive effect on specific norms, and it should be taken into consideration that some norms are more likely to have the opposite position. In other words, the norms do not support cooperation, exchange, and change while also making the groups stiff and restricted in access which is not appropriate because relatively free space is required in the process of sharing information and knowledge. Therefore, it should be understood that the important point for the existence of norms in the community is to enable community manager to facilitate the exchange and collaboration in the form of the community through the limitation of their scope (Jadin et al., 2013). A possible explanation for this may be that an effective organisation requires a constant balance against the opposing force (Charband & Navimipour, 2016; Chung et al., 2015).

According to Christou (2016), tourism products are widely known as products that have a high-involvement and high risk for travellers, particularly in the aspects of money, time, success, security, and other risks in tourism objects. Accordingly, these conditions have made the travelling plan design complex which further requires the travellers to identify, filter, evaluate, and select the extensive amount of information (Benur & Bramwell, 2015; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2016). On a positive note, the aspects of trust and obligation are ideally important in the process of knowledge sharing in the online community (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012; Charband & Navimipour, 2016).

Furthermore, the research results on the online community of BPI indicate that the relationship between trust and obligations towards the process of knowledge sharing is in very low to low category. Apart from that, the results illustrated that the online community members of BPI tend to have a low level of confidence and a sense of duty in the process of knowledge sharing among fellow members. The previous research of Wasko and Faraj (2008) explained that the

community members who do not have an adequate vision of knowledge would find it difficult to believe the knowledge provided by their fellow members, but it is not necessarily right for contributors. In other words, they will not easily believe the knowledge they read due to their existing knowledge which usually leads to a low level of trust in the community.

The findings of the present study are in line with the research of Hichang et al., (2010) which stated that individuals are more likely to share their knowledge when they are convinced that their knowledge is useful for the group. Their contributions can make a positive difference to the community. In the case of the current research, the dimension of obligation is in a low category. At the same time, the tendency is very low because the community members do not feel confident in contributing. According to Srivastava & Banaji (2011), regarding Situated Learning Theory, new members tend to join the community in a transition time; hence, more extended learning and active participation will further polish their skills. Therefore, the role of collaborators is indispensable for bridging the diversity of competence among the online community members.

On another note, the dimension of relational social capital is the dimension of identification. The research results on the online communities of Backpacker Indonesia demonstrated that the level of relationship between the dimension of identification and the process of knowledge sharing was higher compared to the other three dimensions. The level of relationship with the highest score between the dimension of identification and internalisation is related to the item of needs among the online community members such as the willingness to build shared knowledge about tourism activities. Moreover, it can be explained that the online community members have the same knowledge needs about tourism activities which encourages them to share their knowledge in the effort of establishing shared knowledge.

Furthermore, the condition can become a significant capital for the sustainability of the online community of BPI. The high degree of identification with the prominent group can be directed to knowledge outputs. Specifically, identification enables the involved parties to understand, appreciate, and feel connected to the needs and desires of others. As argued by Wasko and Faraj (2008), those who have been strongly identified within the network can be more helpful to others and can obtain immediate help when needed.

The results for the first hypothesis found that motivation, competence, and the period of membership play a significant role in this matter. This is in line with the results of the research conducted by Wasko and Faraj (2008). In the case of the current research, the majority of the respondents remain in the early membership of the online community or also known as the "newbie" rating. Moreover, it is determined on the basis of BPI's active members in the online community (www.backpackerindonesia.com). Therefore, this requires various types of research to investigate whether the activity in the online communities of Backpacker Indonesia

affects the high contribution of the social-relational capital towards the process of knowledge sharing.

Technology Factors towards the Process of Knowledge Process in the Online Community of “Backpacker Indonesia”

The second hypothesis that proposed in the current research was the effects of technology factors on the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of Backpackers Indonesia". The statistical tests demonstrated that technology factors significantly affect the process of knowledge, thus indicating that the hypothesis that is accepted.

The research results are in line with the results of the previous research conducted by Ismail and Yusof (2010) which found that the technology factors have a positive and significant relationship with knowledge sharing and provide necessary contributions towards knowledge sharing. Other than that, simple technology, well-maintained infrastructure, and trained community members can encourage better knowledge sharing. Meanwhile, research conducted by Wahlroos (2011) showed that technology factors tend to affect the respondents in the process of knowledge sharing on social media. The more user-friendly social media and better technical capabilities of the ownership of the respondents indicate that social media will be utilised more frequently.

On a more important note, an interdimensional analysis was carried out to find out more detail about the condition of the relationship between the technological factors and the process of knowledge sharing. The results showed that it was in the medium level in the online community of BPI. Apart from that, it was found that there was a pair of dimensions that were not significant or had no close relationship such as the dimension of convenience facilities in the combination phase for the process of knowledge sharing. According to Nonaka (2008), the combination phase is described as a phase when new knowledge is created by reconfiguring information through the process of sorting, adding, combining, and categorising. This condition further suggests that the community members in the combination phase prefer to utilise existing knowledge on the website of BPI.

In addition, the level of the relationship with the highest score in the analysis between these dimensions was on the dimension of the site content with the internalisation phase of knowledge sharing. In this phase, the community members tend to make travel plans, travelling, record and write back what they understood from BPI's website based on the knowledge obtained from the online community of BPI (Buabeng-Andoh, 2012).

Regarding this matter, the discussion results on the second hypothesis stated that the main factor that affects the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of BPI were content site, particularly regarding the availability of knowledge on the site. The availability of

knowledge on the website encourages its members to share knowledge actively. The knowledge received from the online forum could be well understood, particularly among the community members and the results of their understanding were written back on the BPI site. Meanwhile, it should be understood that more simple (user-friendly) existing facilities, as well as the ownership of good technical ability of the respondents, lead to a higher increase in knowledge sharing activities among the members.

As a whole, the effects of technology factor on the process of knowledge sharing only reached 31%. In line with Media Richness Theory, the findings from the current research directions that offline meetings remain necessary given knowledge needs, particularly concerning tourism products because they are considered as complex and high-risk knowledge. The perfection in Media Richness Theory describes that media is able to convey information (Charband & Navimipour, 2016). In other words, face to face or offline communication is regarded as the wealthiest media. Moreover, immediacy can be more awakened with the help of offline meetings, while the need for clarity, mutual understanding, non-verbal communication, and feedback can be more fulfilled (Ellison et al., 2015). Therefore, the online community manager of BPI should increase the number of offline meeting activities for the online community members of BPI to increase the closeness and identification between members.

Overall, it is undeniable that new media brings a change in human communication even though knowledge sharing through online media will never be able to completely replace face-to-face interaction (Fang & Chiu, 2010).

Relational Social Capital and Technology Factors towards the Process of Knowledge Sharing in the Online Community of "Backpacker Indonesia"

The third hypothesis proposed by the current research was "the relational social capital and technology factors have simultaneous effects on the process of knowledge sharing in the online community of Backpackers Indonesia". In this case, the results of the statistical test demonstrated that relational social capital and technology factors have simultaneously significant effects on the process of knowledge sharing, which suggests that the hypothesis is accepted.

Furthermore, the research results simultaneously showed that the technological factors had a greater effect compared to relational social capital, which is in line with the test that was partially carried out by the researchers. Hence, it can be explained that the members of BPI's online community prefer sufficiency and novelty of knowledge as well as the ease of utilising the existing facilities on BPI website when carrying out the process of knowledge sharing activities. The knowledge adequacy becomes the central point given the results of data analysis

which showed that it is the indicator with the highest value, mainly when it is related to the process of knowledge sharing in the internalisation phase.

The research discussion results are in agreement with previous researches which successfully identified other factors that affect the relationship, motivation, competence, and period of membership (Ellison et al., 2015; Iskoujina, 2010; Wasko & Faraj, 2008). More importantly, it should be noted that these factors can become variables in researches regarding online communities.

The important findings from the current research are the willingness of online community members of BPI to share their knowledge in the effort of creating shared knowledge. This is prone to happen when they feel identified with the online community, particularly when they have the relatedness needs among fellow members of the online community. Finally, the online community members are stimulated to perform the internalisation process such as learning to make travel plans, do travelling and write back the knowledge of their travel results on BPI site as a new knowledge with the support of existing content on the site.

Conclusion

The results of the research showed that relational social capital significantly affects the process of knowledge sharing. Moreover, it must be noted that this mainly occurs between the identification dimension in relational social capital variable and the combination dimension in the knowledge sharing variable. Other than that, a sense of the relatedness needs among the online community members increases their desire to build knowledge sharing regarding tourism activities.

In addition, the research results demonstrated that technology factors significantly affect the process of knowledge sharing. In this case, this particularly occurs between the site content dimension in the technology factor variable and the internalisation dimension in knowledge sharing variable. The availability of knowledge on the site encourages the community members to share knowledge based on their understanding when being involved in online forum discussion.

Furthermore, the results showed that relational social capital and technology factors simultaneously affect the process of knowledge sharing. The technology factors alone have a greater effect on the process of knowledge sharing compared to relational social capital. The site content dimension in the technology factors variable is a dimension that is closely related to the process of knowledge sharing, particularly in the internalisation phase.



The most important research findings stated that the online community members are willing to share their knowledge in creating shared knowledge, especially when they feel identified with the community and have a sense of relatedness needs among fellow members of the community. Furthermore, the community members carry out the internalisation process which includes the learning process to make travel plans, do travelling and write back the knowledge of the travelling results on the site as a form of new knowledge to support the existing content on the site.

REFERENCES

- Benur, A. M., & Bramwell, B. (2015). Tourism product development and product diversification in destinations. *Tourism Management, 50*, 213–224.
- 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 factors, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly, 29*(1), 87–111.
- Buabeng-Andoh, C. (2012). Factors influencing teachers' adoption and integration of information and communication technology into teaching: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Education and Development Using ICT, 8*(1).
- Button, D., Harrington, A., & Belan, I. (2014). E-learning & information communication technology (ICT) in nursing education: A review of the literature. *Nurse Education Today, 34*(10), 1311–1323.
- Charband, Y., & Jafari Navimipour, N. (2018). Knowledge sharing mechanisms in the education: A systematic review of the state of the art literature and recommendations for future research. *Kybernetes, 47*(7), 1456–1490.
- Charband, Y., & Navimipour, N. J. (2016). Online knowledge sharing mechanisms: a systematic review of the state of the art literature and recommendations for future research. *Information Systems Frontiers, 18*(6), 1131–1151.
- Chow, W. S., & Chan, L. S. (2008). Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information & Management, 45*(7), 458–465.
- Christou, E. (2016). Knowledge Management and Web 2.0: Preliminary Findings from the Greek Tourism Industry. In *Social Media in Travel, Tourism and Hospitality* (pp. 283–302). Routledge.
- Chung, H.-F., Cooke, L., Fry, J., & Hung, I.-H. (2015). Factors affecting knowledge sharing in the virtual organisation: Employees' sense of well-being as a mediating effect. *Computers in Human Behavior, 44*, 70–80.
- Dalziel, T., Gentry, R. J., & Bowerman, M. (2011). An integrated agency–resource dependence view of the influence of directors' human and relational capital on firms' R&D spending. *Journal of Management Studies, 48*(6), 1217–1242.
- Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Harvard Business Press.
- Dwityas, N. A., & Briandana, R. (2017). Social Media in Travel Decision Making Process.



International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 7(7), 291–292.

- Ellison, N. B., Gibbs, J. L., & Weber, M. S. (2015). The use of enterprise social network sites for knowledge sharing in distributed organizations: The role of organizational affordances. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(1), 103–123.
- Fang, Y.-H., & Chiu, C.-M. (2010). In justice we trust: Exploring knowledge-sharing continuance intentions in virtual communities of practice. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 235–246.
- Faraj, S., & Wasko, M. M. (2001). The web of knowledge: An investigation of knowledge exchange in networks of practice. *Paper Submitted for Publication*.
- Gray, B. (2004). Informal learning in an online community of practice. *Journal of Distance Education*, 19(1), 20–35.
- Hichang, C., Chen, M., & Chung, S. (2010). Testing an integrative theoretical model of knowledge-sharing behavior in the context of Wikipedia. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(6), 1198–1212.
- Hsu, Y. (2011). Design innovation and marketing strategy in successful product competition. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 26(4), 223–236.
- Iskoujina, Z. (2010). *Knowledge sharing in virtual organisations: the case of open source software communities*. Durham University.
- Ismail, M. B., & Yusof, Z. M. (2010). The Contribution of technological factors on knowledge sharing quality among government officers in Malaysia. In *Knowledge management*. IntechOpen.
- Jadin, T., Gnambs, T., & Batinic, B. (2013). Personality traits and knowledge sharing in online communities. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), 210–216.
- Kiesler, S. (2014). The Rise and Fall of Netville: The Saga of a Cyberspace Construction Boomtown in the Great Divide. In *Culture of the Internet* (pp. 19–50). Psychology Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1994). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. MIT press.
- Mtapuri, O., & Giampiccoli, A. (2016). Towards a comprehensive model of community-based tourism development. *South African Geographical Journal*, 98(1), 154–168.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242–266.
- Nonaka, I. (2008). *The knowledge-creating company*. Harvard Business Review Press.



- Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2015). The knowledge-creating theory revisited: knowledge creation as a synthesizing process. In *The essentials of knowledge management* (pp. 95–110). Springer.
- Rekarti, E., & Doktoralina, C. M. (2017). Improving Business Performance: A Proposed Model for SMEs. *European Research Studies Journal*, 20(3A), 613–623.
- Srivastava, S. B., & Banaji, M. R. (2011). Culture, cognition, and collaborative networks in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 76(2), 207–233.
- Sutono, A., Briandana, R., Doktoralina, C. M., Rekarti, E., & Dwityas, N. A. (2018). Exploration of Marine Tourism in North Sumatra: An Analysis of Promoting Tourism. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 9(2), 210–227. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1178221816685087>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics, 6th edn Boston. *Ma: Pearson*.
- Vaishnavi, V. K., & Kuechler, W. (2015). *Design science research methods and patterns: innovating information and communication technology*. Crc Press.
- Wahlroos, J. K. (2011). Social media as a form of organizational knowledge sharing.
- Wang, Y., & Pizam, A. (2011). *Destination marketing and management: Theories and applications*. Cabi.
- Wasko, M., & Faraj, S. (2008). The web of knowledge: an investigation of knowledge exchange in networks of practice. *Academy of Management Journal*.