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Abstract

Knowledge sharing has been identified as a critical activity in any knowledge management initiative. It features as one of the phases or stages in many generic knowledge management frameworks. Although much has been written up on knowledge sharing, most focus on the difficulties of or barriers in the knowledge sharing process, and offer suggestions on how to encourage employees to share their knowledge. There has been no attempt to develop a theory of knowledge sharing. This paper reports initial work on the development of a theory for voluntary, informal, knowledge sharing (VIKS) in an academic setting, using the grounded theory methodology. VIKS is a specific type of knowledge sharing with the elements of serendipity (it occurs without pre-planning), spontaneity, (participation occurs out of one’s own free will), and extemporaneousness (participation is off the cuff, without any prior preparation). Seven social milieus have been identified as the basis to elicit data through the use of semi-structured interviews. The focus is on understanding the perceptions of and the motivations behind participation in VIKS, and identifying the factors that impact VIKS. Preliminary results show that participating VIKS is perceived as risk taking, an opportunity for learning and teaching, a social interaction, and an opportunity to fulfill ones calling. The factors that have been identified as important are trust, the availability of time, the kiasu trait, the Asian culture, and the age and age difference of the actors. VIKS primarily perceived to be a face-to-face activity, with technology seen only to enable a wider reach of audience for the knowledge shared.
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1. Introduction

Petersen and Poulfelt (2002) lamented that while the concept of knowledge has been thoroughly discussed from diverse perspectives in the literature, there is still a lack of definitions for knowledge sharing. To them, knowledge sharing “takes place each time you communicate what you are doing, who you are, or what you know to one person or to many people”, and “covers a variety of activities – a talk with a colleague at the coffee pot, an educational situation, a document in a database, an email, an information board with notices,
Several more definitions of knowledge sharing have been uncovered by the authors. Lee & Al-Hawamdeh (2002) defined knowledge sharing as the deliberate act in which knowledge is made reusable for one party through its transfer by another. Wiig (1999) defines it simply as “networking to become acquainted with what others know” (p. 3–4). Christensen (2003) states that knowledge sharing is about identifying accessible knowledge that already exists, and storing and subsequently applying this knowledge to make processes faster, better or safer than they would have otherwise been.

Knowledge sharing is central to the interrelated concepts of organisational learning, knowledge creation, and knowledge management (Andrews & Delahaye, 1999). This can be seen from the fact that knowledge sharing (sometimes under the guise of knowledge transfer, distribution, or diffusion) is one of the processes in many generic knowledge management models. As knowledge sharing is, to a large extent, about communication, concepts central to the communication process, like sender, receiver, message and channel, are important in knowledge sharing as well. Teece (1998, p. 60) states that for service firms in the new economy, knowledge sharing itself is often the basis of competitive advantage. Knowledge sharing is important as it prevents “reinvention of the wheel”, i.e. redundancy in knowledge production leading to costly duplications, it ensures the spread of best practices, and it avails private knowledge to the problem-solving process. As complexity has increased, work in general, has also become more cooperative and interdependent in nature, with teams becoming the dominant work unit. Teamwork and collaboration requires knowledge sharing to work.

If nature has made any one thing less susceptible than all others of exclusive property, it is the action of the thinking power called an idea, which an individual may exclusively possess as long as he keeps it to himself; but the moment it is divulged, it forces itself into the possession of every one, and the receiver cannot dispossess himself of it. Its peculiar character, too, is that no one possesses the less, because every other possesses the whole of it. He who receives an idea from me, receives instruction himself without lessening mine; as he who lights his taper at mine, receives light without darkening me.

Thomas Jefferson (1813)

Knowledge sharing can either be voluntary or mandatory (Fig. 1). Thomas Jefferson (1813) has made it clear that that a thought, an idea, or an insight, essentially all knowledge, is exclusive to its possessor until he decides to share it with others. There is no way for an external party to know the contents of a person’s mind, much less to coerce him to articulate it to others. The decision to share lies entirely with the possessor. One can only hope that he is willing to avail his knowledge voluntarily. There can be enticements and rewards of various types, but the possessor can decide not to bite the bait – the contents of the human mind is his exclusive property. Jefferson highlighted two other properties of knowledge directly relevant to the knowledge sharing phenomena. Firstly, the fact that knowledge sharing cannot be reversed; once shared, knowledge becomes the property of everyone and exclusive ownership of that knowledge is lost forever. Secondly, the fact that knowledge has a non-rivalrous nature, meaning that even if it is consumed by one person, it is still available for consumption by others, unlike traditional factors of production. These unique properties of knowledge has led to the development of intellectual property right such as trade secrets.
protection and patents, copyright, and trademarks, which provide the knowledge creator with some protection.

Fig. 1 Categories of Knowledge Sharing

On the other end of the scale is mandatory knowledge sharing. This is the form of knowledge sharing that is normally expected as part of one’s job, and includes such things as giving a speech at a graduation ceremony, teaching a class at university, or contributing a section in an annual report. It is considered mandatory as negative consequences will result from non-performance.

The second aspect of knowledge sharing is the degree of formality. Formality here refers to the degree of fixedness of time, location, content, and actor roles. For example, in the case of a professor teaching a class, the time and location, and the content of the lecture, is largely fixed beforehand. The roles of the players in the knowledge sharing transaction are well defined. In this case, the professor takes on the role of the teacher, is the source of knowledge and will therefore act primarily as the transmitter of knowledge. The recipients of the knowledge will be the role of his students. Consider the description of Xerox’s “Tech Reps” sharing knowledge (Brown & Duguid, 1998), which is an example of VIKS. Although the “Tech Reps” work most of the time in relative isolation, they met over breakfast, lunch, coffee, or at the end of the day to swap “war stories” about malfunctioning machines:

Like two jazz players involved in an extended, improvisational riff, they spent an afternoon picking up each other’s half-finished sentences and partial insights while taking turns to run the machine and watch it crash until finally and indivisibly they reached a coherent account of why the machine didn’t work. They tested the theory. It proved right. And the machine was fixed.

No clear roles existed in the knowledge sharing activity described above – each one was completing each other’s half-finished sentences, trying to converge to a shared understanding of the problem. The topic of discussion was not decided upon prior to the knowledge sharing transaction, and the transaction itself took place among equals. There are usually elements of serendipity, spontaneity, and extemporaneousness in VIKS. VIKS is serendipitous because it occurs without planning, spontaneous because participation occurs out of one’s own free will, and extemporaneous as contribution is off the cuff, without any prior preparation. The participant in a VIKS activity, for example, does not share with pre-prepared transparencies,
slides, or handouts. Finally, VIKS can take place through the document, or without the use of a document. The document, which can be a traditional or electronic document, ensures that the knowledge shared has potential to be persistent.

Knowledge sharing can also take place in the absence of a document, e.g., through a conversation, which is only accessible to those within an earshot of the VIKS activity. These boundaries characterise VIKS effectively rule out meetings, lectures and tutorials, and presentations in research seminars. The objective of this research is to develop a theory of VIKS through the grounded theory methodology.

2. Literature Review

Constant, Sproull, and Kiesler (1996) investigated voluntary sharing of technical knowledge over the computer network at Tandem Computers, a Fortune 500 computer manufacturer employing 11,000 people worldwide. Their research focused on requests for technical information, broadcast over “second class email” which is designated for work-related broadcast messages that go to the entire organisation, which includes announcements from headquarters, industry news, and requests for information. They found that 91% of the replies were received from people with weak ties to the requester, their relationships being characterized by the absence or infrequency of contact, the lack of emotional closeness, and no history of reciprocal services. Weak ties were found to be useful in obtaining technical advice from people with superior resources. The motivations for replying were classified into two categories, personal benefits, and organizational motivation. The three most highly ranked personal benefits were “I enjoy helping others”, “I enjoy solving problems”, and “I enjoy earning respect”. The three most highly ranked organizational motivations were “Being a good company citizen”, “The problem is important to the company”, and “It’s part of my job to answer questions like this one”. Replies from people responding out of organizational motivation were rated as more useful over those responding out of personal benefit.

Davenport and Prusak (1998) introduced the concept of knowledge transactions, i.e., the buying, selling, and brokering of knowledge. Knowledge transactions take place in knowledge markets, which are embedded in, and affected by social and political realities. The social forces which play were identified as reciprocity, reputation, altruism, and trust. Knowledge sharing takes place if the knowledge buyer anticipates that the knowledge buyer possesses knowledge that will be potentially useful to him in the future and that the knowledge buyer will be a willing seller when he is in the market for this knowledge. Knowledge sharing also is more likely when a buyer has a reputation of a valuable knowledge source. Knowledge sharing may take place as a result of altruism – people with a natural inclination to help others, people who are passionate about their knowledge, and those going through their “generative stage”. Lastly, trust is vitally important for knowledge market to function effectively.

Abrams, Cross, Lesser, and Levin (n.d.) investigated the link between trust and knowledge sharing. They found that two types of trust were instrumental in knowledge sharing – benevolence-based trust (an individual will not harm another when given the opportunity to do so) and competence-based trust (an individual is knowledgeable in a given subject area). While these two forms of trust can exist independently, knowledge sharing is more effective when the knowledge recipient viewed the knowledge source as being both benevolent and competent. Trust can be developed through both “strong ties” (frequent interactions) and
“weak ties” (infrequent interactions). Further, weak ties lead to more valuable knowledge than strong ties, as individuals with weak ties are likely to have connections to different social networks, and therefore have access to different perspectives and ideas for any given problem.

The second issue was the relationship between the type of knowledge and the type of trust. They found that while benevolence-based trust was important in the sharing of both tacit and explicit knowledge, competence-based trust was critical in knowledge sharing involving highly tacit knowledge. The last issue was on what factors knowledge seekers used to determine if they felt an individual was trustworthy. For competence-based trust, the existence of a common language and vision, and discretion were important factors. For benevolence-based trust, in addition to the three factors above, receptivity and strong ties were important. They suggest that managers create a common understanding of how work gets accomplished, demonstrate trust-building behaviours, and create physical and virtual spaces to bring people together.

3. The Research Entity

The research will be a case study of the College of Engineering (CoE) at the Nanyang Technological University (NTU) in Singapore. NTU has its roots in Nanyang Technological Institute (NTI), which was established in August 1981. Initially intended to be a technology-based university, its three pioneering schools were all engineering schools – Schools of Civil & Structural Engineering, Electrical & Electronic Engineering, and Mechanical & Production Engineering. On 1 July 1991, NTI was reconstituted as by incorporating the National Institute of Education (NIE). At the same time, it was renamed Nanyang Technological University and empowered to award its own degrees. Although other non-engineering schools have been added since 1981, CoE remains the dominant college, with its students forming approximately two-thirds of the undergraduate students, and more than half of the masters students.

NTU undertook a major restructuring to streamline schools of related disciplines into colleges. CoE was established in 1 July 2001 as a result of this restructuring. It is anticipated that the establishment of CoE will lead to enhanced synergy between the component engineering schools through closer interaction of staff, jointly taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, sharing of best practices across different schools, inter-engineering research, and a unified front in dealings with external parties both locally and internationally (NTU, 2002). The schools under CoE are further divided into divisions, with the smallest school (Materials Engineering) having two divisions, and the largest school (Electrical and Electronic Engineering), having six divisions.

4. Methodology

The grounded theory methodology (GTM) will be used to construct the theory. As GTM relies on theoretical sampling, the first stage of the research has been focused on where we might go to uncover phenomena important to VIKS. The literature has been used to identify the different social milieus on which the issue of VIKS may be segmented. The seven social milieus, were then used to direct theoretical sampling.
I Non-Tenured Academic Staff

The purpose of tenure is twofold. The first is to safeguard academic freedom. The logic here is that as academics are custodian of truth, they must be allowed to teach unpopular ideas. Tenure also allows senior faculty to embark on risky projects that might take years for the benefits to become apparent (Snodgrass, 2002). Secondly tenure is seen as a fitting reward that makes a very long apprenticeship seen worth the effort (Edwards, 1979). However, Miller (1979) argues that this system has created two classes – the tenured (who are powerful and secure), and the untenured (who must be careful not to offend). Therefore, instead of safeguarding academic freedom, the tenure system has worked against it to become one of the chief causes of intellectual cowardice. This may result in an unwillingness to articulate controversial ideas.

II Academic staff without PhDs

This social milieu can be divided into two categories. The first are the lecturers, and the second are academics who are either assistant or associate professors, most of whom are in the process of getting their PhDs. A cursory survey indicates that no more than 5% of the academics are in this social milieu. A person’s academic credentials locates him in academia. Do they feel inferior, suppressed, or intimidated in a work setting where academic credentials are of paramount importance? Does the lack of a PhD cause them to be reticent? Are they hesitant or reluctant when it comes to sharing their knowledge?

III Academic staff teaching ancillary subjects

These are academics who teach ancillary subjects, in the area of English language (communication skills) and economics at CoE, and be considered an out-group. These are subject areas which are not the raison d’être of CoE. These academics play a supportive role, and form the minority in CoE.

IV Female academic staff

As engineering is a male dominated profession, and female academic staff form the numerical minority in the engineering school, this may put female academic staff in a lower social status.

Milieus I – IV are about hierarchies, the vertical dimension of stratification. While the hierarchy is a basic characteristic of every organization as it is needed to implement authority, the hierarchy is expected to have an impact on knowledge sharing. As Tannenbaum (1966) noted, they are divisive, results in resentment, hostility, and opposition, and has profound psychological implications for the organisation’s members. Hierarchy also affects the status of the members of an organization. Status, in turn, has self-esteem implications.

V The new hires

Time is needed for trust to be formed and relationships to be made. The new hires, especially those from abroad may find that they lack enterprise navigation knowledge – “the understanding of whom to contact, and how to treat them in special situations
or how to handle non-routine challenges” – which constitutes a major part of the typical employee’s valuable knowledge (Wiig, 1999, p. 3-4). The lack of firm experience may affect one’s willingness to participate in VIKS. This milieu will be studied by sampling from academics who are in their first year with CoE.

VI Academic staff who have completed their PhD’s in a foreign language

Abell (2000), writing about the skills required for knowledge management, stressed the importance of verbal, written, and presentation skills, as they are required to influence, persuade, negotiate, and share knowledge. The critical role of language in the knowledge sharing process was apparent in Husted & Michailova’s (n.d.) study of Russian companies with foreign participation. Simonin (1999, p. 472–473) has remarked that “the lack of fluency in a partner’s native language may constitute the single greatest obstacle since even well codified knowledge remains inaccessible”. NTU has a cross-cultural setting, where academics of different nationalities from different historical and cultural backgrounds collaborate. While English is the medium of instruction, some academics have done a significant portion of their formal education in languages other than English. This milieu will be explored by sampling from academics that have either completed PhDs in languages other than English or taught in institutions of higher learning where the medium of instruction is not English.

VII Academic Staff With Formal Administrative Roles

These are academics who hold administrative positions at CoE. Some administrative positions which have been identified are Division Heads, Director of Research Centres, and Coordinators of academic programmes. While every academic has administrative responsibilities, the administration is expected to occupy a larger percentage of time as they hold official “titles”, and their positions necessitate them to do budgeting, hiring of staff, requisition, writing of research proposals, and other administrative work.

The seven milieus have been chosen “by its relevance to the research problem” (Merriam, 2002, p. 143), and selected to represent diverse perspectives, thus maximizing variation in the data gathered and making for a richer grounded theory. While the seven milieus have been identified a priori, the researchers were open to incorporating additional milieus that may have to be added to probe particular themes that emerge during the data collection process. Thirty people from all the different engineering schools in CoE who fall under one or more of the seven milieus have been identified. Of these, eleven have so far been interviewed through a one-hour semi-structured interview (Table 1). A two-section topic guide was used during the interviews. Section I comprised of general questions which probed actual instances of VIKS in which the respondent had participated. Section II comprised of milieu-specific questions. All eleven interviews were recorded and transcribed, and key concepts have been identified. The results presented in the following section contribute to the emergent theory of VIKS.
Table 1 The social milieu(s) in which respondents belong (N = 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Preliminary Results

5.1 Perceptions of Knowledge Sharing

In their research, Strauss and Corbin (1990) found that cancer patients viewed their cancer in two ways – as a disease and as an experience. In this research, we tried to uncover how participants viewed VIKS. We found three perceptions of VIKS emerging from the interviews completed so far: (1) as an activity that requires its participants to take risks; (2) as a form of social interaction, (3) as an opportunity to teach and learn, and (4) as an opportunity to fulfill ones calling. Risks when participating in VIKS arise in several ways. First, there is a concern that the receiver might misrepresent or misconstrue the knowledge shared. This may arise out of carelessness or malice, especially when the reasons for VIKS are unstated. The knowledge shared might also be taken out of context. Second, there is the risk that VIKS may translated to more work for oneself when a suggestion is volunteered, as the one who volunteers the suggestion may end up having to implement the suggestion. Third, the fear of appearing stupid when asking questions to which answers are obvious to others. Fourth, VIKS is risky as it may potentially lead to arguments, creating a problematic situation because “unlike Westerners, we may not talk after having an argument”. Fifth, a high degree of risk is involved when sharing with a person with punitive powers, e.g. one’s direct supervisor. Respondent M7 was afraid of the “black book” that the Dean may be carrying around to jot down the wrong things said. Respondent M4 quoted the Chinese phrase “duǒ shuō duǒ cuō”, which roughly translates to “the more one speaks, the more mistakes one makes”. Another situation involving a high degree of risks is the sharing of scientific ideas is seen as particularly risky as the idea may be stolen, or adapted for the recipient’s own use. M8 highlighted that the spirit of competition has resulted in a reduction of the sharing of such ideas, as people are more protective over knowledge that may be material for patents or research papers. A protection from idea stealing is to be sufficiently vague when talking about it. Not surprisingly, the most important prerequisite for participating in VIKS was trust.

Besides risk, VIKS is also perceived as a two-way, face-to-face, social interaction in the form of conversations, dialogues, discussions and chats that provide opportunities to maintain social relationships. The social interaction is seen as important to build trust, to strengthen ties, and to develop relationships – in short, to develop social capital. Not surprisingly, the
knowledge shared comprised both of social knowledge, e.g. on the current Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome crisis, as well as work-related knowledge, e.g. on research proposals and teaching methods. VIKS presents opportunities to teach, learn, and update each other on the latest happenings (such as policies, event, guidelines, procedures, etc.). In teaching, one has the opportunity to clarify concepts to oneself. Respondent M9 remarked, “to learn, one has to share knowledge”. Getting an additional perspective on an issue, getting an “outsiders” view of a problem, getting up to speed quickly about something, and making sense of a situation together, all require a willingness to participate in VIKS. Lastly, VIKS is seen as an opportunity to fulfill ones calling of sharing knowledge with others.

5.2 The Importance of Physical Location and Occasion

VIKS occurred most frequently in canteens and restaurants during mealtimes (predominantly during lunch and tea), at staff offices when colleagues dropped in at anytime of the day, and even in the examination hall during invigilation. An important factor in determining the location was informality, where participants “can let their hair down, and discuss anything under the sun”. The location should also be neutral ground that fosters an egalitarian exchange. Opportunities for VIKS occasions are important. A respondent remarked that after over a year at NTU, he still did not know the research facilities available in the other engineering schools. This knowledge would be important to help him initiate a collaborative research project with another school.

5.3 The Factors Affecting VIKS

Trust, and comfort level with other participants in the VIKS event, is an important factor. The length of time with which one has work and interacted with others in the university helps build trust. Actor attributes like a non-judgmental, encouraging, and empathizing nature helps. The availability of time was seen as an important barrier, with most stating that administrative work gets in the way. A features of the Asian culture, respect and reverence for the elderly, translates, in the workplace, to a respect for superiors. Just as one would not want to contradict, argue with, or talk back against an elderly member of the family, one would also not want to do any of these things with one’s superiors. This results in decrease knowledge sharing. Another feature of the Asian culture is the lack of openness, which is required for VIKS.

A particular Singapore trait, termed kiasu\(^1\), has also been identified as a factor affecting VIKS. Kiasu literally translated, means “afraid to lose out” (Seaton, et al., 1997). This trait is related to the risk perception of VIKS in that one risks loosing out to another once knowledge is shared. Personality plays a part, with the gregarious and those that like to talk finding it easier to share knowledge. Hierarchy poses a problem, as respondents are unsure if the knowledge shared may be used against them at some point in the future.

5.4 The Role of Technology

NTU has an extensive IT infrastructure which may help in VIKS. These include the corporate portal (iGEMS), the e-mail and phonemail systems, and the e-learning platform

---

\(^{1}\) Kiasu has been defined as an attitude by which a person undergoes, on the one hand, extreme disquiet if he discovers that he has not got full value for his expenditure of money, time and effort, and on the other, a distinct sense of exhilaration if he discovers that he has got much more than the full value for that expenditure. The ultimate distress is when he has got nothing for something, and the ultimate joy when he has got something for nothing. (Brown, 1999, p. 123)
Respondents viewed technology as being useful to VIKS to the extent that it enables a wider reach for the knowledge shared. The downside of technology in VIKS is that it reduces the time available for face-to-face knowledge sharing; it requires an additional step (logging in) just to share knowledge, and it is still not portable. Respondent M8 blamed technology for reducing the opportunities for people to interact face-to-face, observing that the corridors were frequently empty and that the telephone seldom rings. He attributed these to being due to an excessive reliance on email and the World Wide Web.

6. Discussion

The perception of VIKS as risk-taking, and the resulting need for a safe environment is consistent with von Krogh’s (1998) observation that at the level of the individual, knowledge creation is unproblematic as it involves making sense out of a new situation by justifying it against one’s observation of the world, using one’s own unique viewpoint, personal sensemaking, and individual experience. However, knowledge creation in a social context is more difficult as it starts with the sharing of tacit knowledge to create concepts, and this hinges on the ability of an individual to share their personal true beliefs about a situation in the presence of other team members. Justification, in this case, is public, and takes the form of knowledge sharing. He stresses the need to make knowledge sharing less fragile by fostering the enabling condition of care in organisational relationships, which gives rise to trust, active empathy, access to help, lenience in judgment, and courage.

Indwelling, which is important in the sharing of tacit knowledge, is only possible when there is a high level of care. In a supportive environment, colleagues show interest and dwell in each other’s experiences, perspectives, and concepts. “Looking at” becomes “looking with”. This makes it easier for individuals to spontaneously articulate his knowledge (e.g. tricks used to overcome obstacles) while learning. Unconventional language can be used, and reasons behind good or bad performance can be revealed. The emotional aspects of an experienced can be expressed (von Krogh, 1998).

Bohm, Factor, and Garrett (1991) attributes the reasons why talking about subjects that matter deeply to people often results in dispute, division, and even violence, to a deep and pervasive defect in the process of human thought – its lack of proprioception, which is the lack of awareness of our thoughts while they are actually occurring. While our physical bodies is capable of proprioception, meaning that we are aware of our body’s actions while they are actually occurring, proprioception does not extend to the realm of thought. As a result, thinking consists largely of responses conditioned and biased by previous thought, and reality includes a collection of concepts, memories, and reflexes coloured by one’s personal needs, fears, and desires. The lack of proprioception in the realm of thought conceals these limitations, and succeeds in generating a sense that the way each of us interprets the world is the only sensible way in which it can be interpreted. They propose a new, superior, form of social interaction which they call “dialogue” to slow down the process of thought in order to observe it while it is occurring. Suspension of ones thoughts allows listening to others as well as to oneself, and revelation of its incoherence and distortions. Dialogue provides an arena or space to reflect on the content of thought and examine dynamic structures that govern it – the assumptions, preconceptions, prejudices, impulses and reactions that accompany thoughts, opinions, beliefs and feelings. This makes talking, on which VIKS is built, safe.
Respondents perceive VIKS to be a face-to-face phenomena rather than a technology mediated phenomena. Locke (1998) provides some reasons why this might be so. He writes that the voice, as a vehicle for speech, carries useful information about ourselves. Our voice makes public seven aspects of ourselves that would otherwise be private experiences and personal secrets. The seven are our physical self, our emotionality, our self-identity, our biographical self, our psychological self, our physiology, and our relational self. In other words, our voice conveys our personality, and the seven aspects contribute to the richness, or large communication bandwidth of our voice, enabling connection with those we share knowledge and making it the preferred mode of knowledge sharing.

7. Conclusion

This paper reports initial work on the development of a theory for VIKS in an academic setting using the grounded theory methodology. Seven social milieus have been identified. These were used to identify the respondents for the study. These respondents were interviewed through the use of semi-structured interviews. The focus is on identifying the factors that impact the process of VIKS. Preliminary results from the interviews completed so far show that participating VIKS is perceived as risk-taking, an opportunity for learning and teaching, and a social interaction. The factors that have been identified as important are trust, the availability of time, the kiasu trait, and the Asian culture. Technology is seen to enable a wider reach of audience for the knowledge shared.
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