**Research context and selection of variables:**

Firstly, as mentioned above, no research has investigated online user knowledge contribution in technical and nontechnical knowledge sharing online Q&A communities. We took a chance to explain users' knowledge-sharing behavior who participate in these two kinds of communities. Secondly, researchers have mostly used the online archive to investigate the knowledge contribution at online platforms, as explained in table 1. The majority of variables identified by scholars are based on online archives and hard to measure while collecting responses from users such as informational support (Wang, Lu, Ow, Feng, & Liu, 2021), social feedback (Guan, Wang, Jin, & Song, 2018), commenting and useful voting (Chen, Baird, & Straub, 2019), out degrees post, in degrees feedback, customer expertise (Liu, Cheung, & Lee, 2016), rank on incentive hierarchy, after goal attainment, before goal attainment (Goes, Guo, & Lin, 2016), etc. Few researchers have used the primary data and explain the users' participation behavior in these communities. So we have involved the actual users of these communities in concluding our results. Keeping in mind the objective of this study, we have selected the most significant and relevant variables to measure the users' behavior towards the knowledge contribution in online communities. Thirdly online social interaction's role is ignored by researchers in online Q&A communities science after it was considered first back in 1998 by Tsai & Goshal as social interaction ties in the multinational electronic company (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998) and Wiertz (2007) in firm-hosted commercial online communities (Wiertz & de Ruyter, 2007).

Furthermore, reciprocity is the variable that almost all the researchers have used to investigate the knowledge contribution, so we added this in our study by following early scholars (Guan et al., 2018; Liao, Dong, & Guo, 2020; Liu et al., 2016; Pai & Tsai, 2016). Self-satisfaction is a well-studied motivational factor in management sciences, and we believe it is necessary to understand the knowledge contribution behavior of both types of communities as studied by earlier researchers (Jin, Zhou, Lee, & Cheung, 2013; Liao et al., 2020). Devotion to the community is a variable that can help us understand the emotional attachment of both types of community members, which create a binding force and users continue to contribute knowledge in a specific community, so we have picked this variable to understand the difference of emotional attachment of technical and nontechnical knowledge-sharing community members. Some earlier researchers also studied this antecedent of knowledge sharing (Wiertz & de Ruyter, 2007). As there is no direct extrinsic or monitory reward is associated with the knowledge contribution at online communities. Hence, we believe that community recognition is a kind of intrinsic reward that can motivate users to continue participating and sharing knowledge. We have incorporated community recognition in our model to understand better the users' behavior in both types of communities and specific gender and age groups.

There are several other variables that different scholars have studied. But we believe that these variables do not best fit in the context of our study and will not add a valuable contribution, such as trust (Chiu, Hsu, & Wang, 2006) factor is not much worthy in our study because the trustworthiness of a user can be checked by viewing its online profile and track record of his shared knowledge or by his followers. It is hard to measure the trust factor when we involve users directly. Social feedback (Guan et al., 2018) is also a factor studied by researchers, but it can be better studied when we incorporate comments and conversations of users instead of asking them their perception about social feedback. We believe that there are chances of miss reporting about social feedback, and it can better study by incorporating an online archive. Furthermore, extrinsic rewards (Liou, Chih, Yuan, & Lin, 2016) are also useless to add in the model because this is an open secret that there is no extrinsic reward is associated with these communities.
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