

References

- Adams, D. A., R. R. Nelson, et al. (1992). "Perceived Usefulness, Ease of Use, and Usage of Information Technology: A Replication." MIS Quarterly **16**(2): 227-247.
- Adler, P. S. and S.-W. Kwon (2000). Social Capital: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly. Knowledge and Social Capital. E. L. Lesser, Butterworth-Heinemann: 89-115.
- Adler, P. S. and S.-W. Kwon (2002). "Social Capital: Prospects for a new concept." Academy of Management Review **27**(1): 17-40.
- Ajzen, I. and M. Fishbein (1980). Understanding Attitudes and Social Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Alavi, M. and D. E. Leidner (2001). "Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual foundations and Research Issues." MIS Quarterly **25** (1/March): 107 - 136.
- Alavi, M. and A. Tiwana (2003). Knowledge Management: The Information Technology Dimension. The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management. M. Easterby-Smith and M. A. Lyles, Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 104-121.
- Anderson, J. R. (1976). Language, Memory, and Thought. Hillsdale, Erlbaum.
- Anderson, J. R. (1993). Rules of the Mind. Hillsdale, Erlbaum.
- Andriessen, J. H. E., M. Soekijad, et al., Eds. (2002). Support for Knowledge Sharing in Communities. Delft, Netherlands, Delft University Press.
- Anonymous (2004). "IBM Introduces Collaborative Software Products." Knowledge Management News **December/January**: 25.
- Arnold, B. L. and F. M. Kay (1995). "Social Capital, violations of Trust and the Vulnerability of Isolates: The Social Organization of Law Practice and Professional Self-regulation." International Journal of the Sociology of Law **23**: 321-346.
- Attewell, P. and J. B. Rule (1991). Survey and Other Methodologies Applied to IT Impact Research: Experience from a Comparative Study of Business Computing. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. **3**: 299-315.

- Avison, D. and T. Wood-Harper (2003). Bringing Social and Organizational Issues into Information Systems Development: The Story of Multiview. Socio-Technical and Human Cognition Elements of Information Systems. S. Clarke, E. Coakes, M. G. Hunter and A. Wenn, Information Science Publishing: 5-21.
- Bagozzi, R. P. and J. R. Edwards (1998). "A General Approach for Representing Constructs in Organizational Research." Organizational Research Methods 1(1): 45-87.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Y. Yi, et al. (1991). "Assessing Construct Validity in Organizational Research." Administrative Science Quarterly 36: 421-458.
- Bailey, J. E. and s. W. Pearson (1983). "Development of a tool for measuring and analyzing Computer User Satisfaction." Management Science 29(5): 530-545.
- Ballantine, J., M. Bonner, et al. (1998). Developing a 3-D Model of Information Systems Success. Information Systems Success Measurement. E. J. Garrity and G. L. Sanders. Hershey, USA, London, UK, Idea Group Publishing: 46-59.
- Barki, H. and S. L. Huff (1985). "Change, Attitude to Change, and Decision Support System Success." Information & Management 9(5): 261-268.
- Baroudi, J. J. and W. J. Orlikowski (1989). "The Problem of Statistical Power in MIS Research." MIS Quarterly(March): 87-106.
- Baskerville, R. L. and T. Wood-Harper (1998). "Diversity in Information systems action research methods." European Journal of Information Systems(7): 90-107.
- Beckman, T. J. (1999). The current state of knowledge management. Knowledge Management Handbook. J. Liebowitz. Boca Raton, CRC Press: 1-1 - 1-22.
- Benbasat, I., Ed. (1989). The Information Systems Research Challenge: Experimental Research Methods. Harvard Business School Research Colloquium. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School.
- Benbasat, I., A. S. Dexter, et al. (1981). "An Experimental study of the human/computer interface." Communications of ACM 24(11): 752-762.
- Berlage, T. and M. Sohlenkamp (1999). "Visualizing Common Artefacts to Support Awareness in Computer-Mediated Cooperation." Computer Supported Cooperative Work 8: 207-238.
- Blackler, F. (1995). "Knowledge, Knowledge work and organizations: An Overview and Interpretation." Organization Studies 16(6): 16 - 36.
- Blanchard, A. and T. Horan (1998). "Virtual Communities and Social Capital." Social Science Review 16(3): 293-307.

- Boer, N.-I., P. J. van Baalen, et al. (2002). Relational Dimension of Knowledge sharing. Support for knowledge sharing in communities. J. H. E. Andriessen, M. Soekijad and H. J. Keasberry. Delft, Delft University Press.
- Bonner, M. (1995). DeLone and McLean's Model for Judging Information Systems Success - a retrospective application in manufacturing. Proceeding of the European Conference on IT Investment Evaluation, Henley Management College UK.
- Borghoff, U. M. and R. Pareschi, Eds. (1998). Information Technology for Knowledge Management, Springer.
- Bostrom, R. P. and J. S. Heinen (1977). "MIS Problems and Failures: A Socio-Technical Perspective , Part II: The Application of Socio-Technical Theory." MIS Quarterly / December: 11-28.
- Boudreau, M.-C., D. Gefen, et al. (2001). "Validation in information systems research: A state-of-the-art assessment." MIS Quarterly 25(1): 1-16.
- Brass, D. J. (1995). "A Social Network Perspective on Human Resources Management." Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management 13: 39-79.
- Brooking, A. (1996). Introduction to Intellectual Capital. Cambridge, England, The Knowledge Broker Ltd.
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid (1991). "Organizational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning, and Innovation." Organization Science 2(1): 40-57.
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid (1998). "Organizing Knowledge." California Management Review 40(3): 90-111.
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid (2001). "Knowledge and Organization: A Social-Practice Perspective." Organization Science 12(2): 198-213.
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid (2001). Structure and Spontaneity: Knowledge and Organization. Manging Industrial Knowledge: Creation, Transfer and Utilization. I. Nonaka and D. J. Teece, SAGE Publications: 44-67.
- Burt, R. S. (1992). Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Burt, R. S. (1997). "The Contingent Value of Social Capital." Administrative Science Quarterly(42): 339-365.
- Callaghan, J. (2002). Inside Intranets and Extranets - Knowledge Management and the Struggle for Power. Hampshire, UK, Palgrave.

- Carte, T. A. and C. J. Russell (2003). "In Pursuit of Moderation: Nine Common Errors and Their Solutions." MIS Quarterly 27(3): 479-501.
- Cash, J. I., Jr. and P. R. Lawrence, Eds. (1989). The Information Systems Research Challenge: Qualitative Research Methods. Harvard Business School Research Colloquium. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School.
- Chin, W., A. Gopal, et al. (1997). "Advancing the Theory of Adaptive Structuration: The Development of a Scale to Measure Faithfulness of Appropriation." Information Systems Research 8(4): 342-367.
- Chin, W. w., B. L. Marcolin, et al. (2003). "A Partial Least Squares Latent Variable Modeling Approach for Measuring Interaction Effects: Results from a Monte Carlo Simulation Study and an Electronic-Mail Emotion / Adoption Study." Information Systems Research 14(2): 189-217.
- Chin, W. w., B. L. Marcolin, et al. (2003). "Supplemental Materials." Information Systems Research 14(2): 1-11.
- Chin, W. w. and P. R. Newsted (1999). Structural Equation Modeling Analysis With Small Samples Using Partial Least Squares. Statistical Strategies for Small Sample Research. R. H. Hoyle, Sage Publications: 307-341.
- Chin, W. w. and P. A. Todd (1995). "On the Use, Usefulness, and Ease of Use of Structural Equation Modeling in MIS Research: A Note of Caution." MIS Quarterly June 1995: 237-246.
- Churchill, G. A. (1979). "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Construct." Journal of Marketing Research XVI: 64-75.
- Coakes, E. (2002). Knowledge Management: A Sociotechnical Perspective. Knowledge Management in the Sociotechnical World: The Graffiti Continues. E. Coakes, D. Willis and S. Clarke. London, Springer: 220.
- Coakes, E. (2003). Socio-Technical Thinking -- An Holistic Viewpoint. Socio-Technical and Human Cognition Elements of Information Systems. S. Clarke, E. Coakes, M. G. Hunter and A. Wenn, Information Science Publishing: 1-4.
- Coakes, S. J. and L. G. Steed (1999). SPSS: Analysis without Anguish, John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, D. and L. Prusak (2001). In Good Company: How Social Capital Makes Organizations Work. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Cohen, S. (1998). "Knowldge Management's Killer Applications." Training and Development 52(1): 50-53.

- Coleman, J. S. (2000). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. Knowledge and Social Capital: foundations and Applications. E. L. Lesser. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann: 17-41.
- Collins, D. (1997). "Knowledge work or working knowledge? Ambiguity and confusion in the analysis of the "knowledge age"." Employee Relations **19**(1): 38-50.
- Collins, H. (1997). Human, Machines, and the structure of knowledge. Knowledge Management Tools. R. Ruggles, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Creed, W. E. D. and R. E. Miles (1996). Trust in Organizations: A Conceptual Framework Linking Organizational Forms, Managerial Philosophies, and the Opportunity Costs of Controls. Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, Inc.: 16-38.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions, Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cross, R., S. Borgatti, et al. (2002). "Making Invisible work visible: Using Social network analysis to support strategic collaboration." California Management Review.
- Cross, R., A. Parker, et al. (2001). "Supporting Knowledge Creation and Sharing in Social Networks." Organizational Dynamics **30**(2): 100-120.
- Cross, R. and L. Prusak (2002). "The People who make organizations Go-Or Stop." Harvard Business Review. **June**: 105-112.
- Culnan, M. J. (1983). "Environment Scanning: The Effects of Task Complexity and Source Accessibility on Information Gathering Behavior." Decision Sciences **14**(2): 194-206.
- Davenport, T. H., D. W. De Long, et al. (1998). "Successful Knowledge management Projects." Sloan Management Review **Winter 1998**: 43-57.
- Davenport, T. H., S. L. Jarvenpaa, et al. (1996). "Improving Knowledge Work Processes." Sloan Management Review **Summer**: 53-65.
- Davenport, T. H. and L. Prusak (1998). Working Knowledge: How Organizations manage what they know. Boston, Massachusetts, Harvard Business School Press.
- Davenport, T. H., L. Prusak, et al. (2003). What's the big idea? : Creating and Capitalizing on the best Management thinking. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Davis, F. D. (1986). A Technology Acceptance Model for Empirically Testing New

- End-User Information Systems: Theory and Results. Sloan School of Management. Cambridge, MA, MIT.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology." MIS Quarterly **13**(3): 319-338.
- Davis, F. D., R. P. Bagozzi, et al. (1989). "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: a Comparison of Two Theoretical Models." Management Science **35**(8): 982-1003.
- De Long, D. W. and L. Fahey (2000). "Diagnosing cultural barriers to knowledge management." Academy of Management Executive **14**(4): 113-127.
- DeLone, W. H. and E. R. McLean (1992). "Information Systems Success: The Quest for the Dependent Variable." Information Systems Research **3**(1): 60-95.
- DeLone, W. H. and E. R. McLean (2003). "The DeLone and McLean Model of Information Systems Success: A Ten-Year Update." Journal of Management Information Systems **19**(4): 9-30.
- DeLone, W. H. and E. R. McLean (2004). "Measuring e-Commerce Success: Applying the DeLone & McLean Information Systems Success Model." International Journal of Electronic Commerce **9**(1): 31-47.
- DeSanctis, G. and M. S. Poole (1994). "Capturing the complexity in Advanced Technology Use: Adaptive Structuration Theory." Organization Science **5**(2): 121-147.
- Desouza, K., C. (2003). "Barriers to Effective Use of Knowledge Management Systems in Software Engineering." Communications of The ACM **46**(1): 99-101.
- DeTienne, K. B. and R. J. Jensen (2001). Intranets and Business Model Innovation: Managing Knowledge in the Virtual Organization. Knowledge Management and Business Model Innovation. Y. Malhotra. Hershey, PA, Idea Group Publishing: 198-215.
- Dishaw, M. T. and D. M. Strong (1999). "Extending the technology acceptance model with task-technology fit constructs." Information & Management **36**: 9-21.
- Doll, W. J., A. Hendrickson, et al. (1998). "Using Davis's Perceived Usefulness and Ease-of-use Instruments for Decision Making: A Confirmatory and Multigroup Invariance Analysis." Decision Sciences **29**(4): 839-869.
- Doll, W. J. and G. Torkzadeh (1988). "The measurement of End User Computing Satisfaction." MIS Quarterly **12**(2): 259-274.
- Doll, W. J. and G. Torkzadeh (1991). "The Measurement of End-User Computing Satisfaction: Theoretical and Methodological Issues." MIS Quarterly **March**

1991: 5-10.

- Doll, W. J. and G. Torkzadeh (1998). "Developing a multidimensional measure of system-use in an organizational context." Information & Management **33**: 171-185.
- Dretske, F. (1981). Knowledge and the flow of Information. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Droege, S. B. and J. M. Hoobler (2003). "Employee Turnover and Tacit Knowledge Diffusion: A Network Perspective." Journal of Managerial Issues **XV**(1): 50-64.
- Drucker, P. F. (1999). Management Challenges for the 21st Century. New York, HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Elkjaer, B. (2000). "Learning and getting to know: the case of knowledge workers." Human Resource Development International **3**(3): 343-359.
- Ericsson, F. and A. Avdic (2002). Information Technology and Knowledge Acquisition in Manufacturing Companies: A Scandinavian Perspective. Knowledge Management in the SocioTechnical World: The Graffiti Continues. E. Coakes, D. Willis and S. Clarke. London, Springer-Verlag: 121-135.
- Ettema, J. S. (1985). "Explaining Information System Use with System-monitored vs. Self-reported Use Measure." Public Opinion Quarterly **49**: 381-387.
- Feng, K., E. T. Chen, et al. (2005). "Implementation of Knowledge Management Systems and Firm Performance: An Empirical Investigation." Journal of Computer Information Systems **Winter 2004 - 2005**: 92-104.
- Fichman, R. G. and C. F. Kemerer (1997). "The Assimilation of Software Process Innovations: An Organizational Learning Perspective." Management Science **43**(10): 1345-1363.
- Ford, D. P. (2003). Trust and Knowledge Management: The Seeds of Success. Handbook on Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin Heidelberg New York, Springer-Verlag. **1**: 553-576.
- Fox, W. M. (1995). "Sociotechnical system principles and Guidelines: Past and Present." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science **31**(1): 91-105.
- Franz, C. R. and D. Robey (1986). "Organizational Context, User Involvement and the Usefulness of Information Systems." Decision Sciences **17**(3): 329-356.
- Fuerst, W. L. and P. H. Cheney (1982). "Factors Affecting the Perceived Utilization of Computer-based Decision Support Systems." Decision Sciences **13**(4): 554-569.
- Gallupe, B. (2001). "Knowledge Management systems: surveying the landscape."

international Journal of management reviews 3(1): 61-77.

- Garrity, E. J. and G. L. Sanders (1998). Dimensions of Information Systems Success. Information Systems Success Measurement. E. J. Garrity and G. L. Sanders. Hershey, USA, London, UK, Idea Group Publishing: 13-45.
- Garrity, E. J. and G. L. Sanders (1998). Information Systems Success Measurement. Hershey, USA, Idea Group Publishing.
- Gefen, D. and D. W. Straub (1997). "Gender Differences in the perception and Use of E-Mail: An Extension to the Technology Acceptance Model." MIS Quarterly 21(4): 389-400.
- Gefen, D. and D. W. Straub (2005). "A Practical Guide to Factorial Validity using PLS-Graph: Tutorial and Annotated Example." Communications of the AIS 16: 91 - 109.
- Gefen, D., D. W. Straub, et al. (2000). "Structural Equation Modeling and Regression: Guidelines for research practice." Communications of the AIS 4(August): 1-78.
- Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Berkeley, CA, Univesity of California Press.
- Gillette, J. E. (2002). A practical framewaork for understanding KM. Knowledge Management Strategy and Technology. R. F. Bellaver and J. M. Lusa. Boston, Artech House: 1-22.
- Glymour, C. and P. Spirtes (1988). "Latern Variables, Causal Models and Overidentifying Constraints." Journal of Econometrics 39: 175-198.
- Goodhue, D. L. (1992). User Evaluations of MIS Success: What Are We Really Measure? Proceedings of the Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences, Kauai, Hawaii.
- Goodhue, D. L. (1995). "Understanding User Evaluations of Information Systems." Management Science 41(12): 1827-1844.
- Goodhue, D. L. (1998). "Development and Measurement Validity of a Task-Technology Fit Instrument for User Evaluations of Information Systems." Decision Sciences 29(1): 105-138.
- Goodhue, D. L. and R. L. Thompson (1995). "Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance." MIS Quarterly June 1995: 213-236.
- Goodman, P. S. and E. D. Darr (1998). "Computer-Aided Systems and Communities: Mechanisms for Organizational Learning in Distributed Environments." MIS Quarterly(December): 417-440.

- Gopal, A., R. P. Bostrom, et al. (1993). "Applying Adaptive Structuration Theory to Investigate the Process of Group Support System Use." Journal of Management Information Systems 9(3): 45-69.
- Gordon, J. (2000). The Whole Enchilada: Intellectual Capital and you. The Knowledge Management Yearbook: 2000-2001. J. W. Cortada and J. A. Woods. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann: 157-168.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). "Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm." Strategic Management Journal 17(Winter Special Issue): 109-122.
- Grant, R. M. (2001). Knowledge and organization. Managing Industrial Knowledge: Creation, transfer and utilization. I. Nonaka and D. J. Teece, SAGE Publications: 145-169.
- Gupta, A. and V. Govindarajan (2000). "Knowledge Flows within Multinational Corporations." Strategic Management Journal(21): 473-496.
- Gutek, B. A. (1991). Commentary. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 317-322.
- Gutek, B. A. (1991). Using Survey for MIS Research: One Researcher's Experience. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 373-380.
- Hair, J. F., R. E. Anderson, et al. (1995). Multivariate Data Analysis with readings. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Hansen, M. T. (1997). The Search-Transfer Problem: The role of Weak ties in Sharing Knowledge Across organization subunits. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School: 55.
- Hansen, M. T. (2002). "Knowledge Networks: Explaining Effective Knowledge Sharing in Multiunit Companies." Organization Science 13(3): 232-248.
- Hansen, M. T., N. Nohria, et al. (1999). "what's your strategy for managing knowledge?" Harvard Business Review. March-April: 106-116.
- Hansen, M. T., J. M. Podolny, et al. (2001). "So many ties, so little time: a task contingency prespective on corporate social capital in organizations." Social capital of organizations 18: 21-57.
- Hansmann, K.-W. and C. M. Ringle (2004). SmartPLS Manual. Hamburg, Germany, University of Hamburg.
- Hayes, N. and G. Walsham (2003). Knowledge sharing and ICTs: A relational

- Perspective. The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge management. M. Easterby-Smith and M. A. Lyles, Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 54-77.
- Hildreth, P. J. and C. Kimble (2002). "The Duality of Knowledge." Information Research 8(1): No. 142.
- Hinds, P. and S. Kiesler (1995). "Communication across Boundaries: Work, Structure, and Use of Communication Technologies in a large organization." Organization Science 6(4): 373-393.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1998). "A Brief Tutorial on the Development of Measures for Use in Survey Questionnaires." Organizational Research Methods 1(1): 104-121.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). "Identifying Organizational Subcultures: An Empirical Approach." Journal of Management Studies 35(1): 1-12.
- Holsapple, C. W. (2003). Knowledge and Its Attributes. Handbook on Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer. 1: 165-188.
- Horibe, F. (1999). Managing Knowledge Workers: New skills and attitudes to Unlock the Intellectual Capital in your Organization, John Wiley & Sons.
- Hox, J. J. (1997). From Theoretical Concept to Survey Question. Survey Measurement and Process Quality. B. Lyberg, d. L. Collins and S. Dippo, John Wiley & Sons, Inc: 47-69.
- Huang, J. C. M. and S. L. Pan (2001). Managing Customer Knowledge: A Social Construction Perspective. Knowledge Management in the Social Technical World: The Graffiti Continues. E. Coakes, D. Willis and S. Clarke. London, Springer-Verlag: 93-104.
- Hulland, J. (1999). "Use of Partial Least Squares (PLS) in Strategic Management Research: A Review of Four Recent Studies." Strategic Management Journal 20: 195-204.
- Igbaria, M., N. Zinatelli, et al. (1997). "Personal Computing Acceptance Factors in Small Firms: A Structural Equation Model." MIS Quarterly September 1997: 279-305.
- Ishman, M. (1998). Measuring Information Success at the Individual Level in Cross-Cultural Environments. Information Systems Success Measurement. E. J. Garrity and G. L. Sanders. Hershey, USA, London, UK, Idea Group Publishing: 60-78.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L. and D. E. Leidner (1999). "Communication and Trust in Global

- Virtual." Organization Science 10(6): 791-815.
- Joreskog, K. G. and D. Sorbom (1996). LISREL8: User's Reference Guide. Chicago, IL, Scinetific Software International, Inc.
- Kayworth, T. and D. E. Leidner (2003). Organizational Culture as a Knowledge Resource. Handbook on Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin Heidelberg New York, Springer-Verlag. 1: 235-252.
- Kelloway, E. K. (1998). Using LISREL for Structural Equation Modeling: A Researcher's Guide. Thousand Oaks, CA, SAGE Publications.
- King, J. L. (1991). Commentary. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 291-296.
- King, W. R. and B. J. Epstein (1983). "Assessing Information System Value." Decision Sciences 14(1): 34-45.
- Klein, H. K. and M. D. Myers (1999). "A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information Systems." MIS Quarterly 23(1): 67-94.
- Kleinman, D. L. and S. P. Vallas (2001). "Science, capitalism, and the rise of the "knowledge worker": The changing structure of knowledge production in the United States." Theory and Society 30: 451-492.
- Kling, R. (1991). Adaptive Survey Methods to Study the Social Consequences of Computerization: A Response to Attewell and Rule Based on Five Survey-Based Studies. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School. 3: 337-350.
- Knights, D., F. Murray, et al. (1993). "Networking as Knowledge Work: A Study of Strategic Interorganizational Development in the Financial Services Industry." Journal of Management Studies 30(6): 975-995.
- Kogut, B. and U. Zander (1992). "Knowledge of the firm. Combinative Capabilities, and the Replication of Technology." Organization Science 3(3): 383-397.
- Krackhardt, D. and J. R. Hanson (1993). "Informal Networks: The Company behind the Chart." Harvard Business Review. July-August: 104-111.
- Kraemer, K. L., Ed. (1991). The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. Harvard Business School Research Colloquium. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School.
- Kraemer, K. L. and W. H. Dutton (1991). Survey Research in the Study of Management

- Information Systems. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 3-57.
- Lamb, R. and R. Kling (2003). "Reconceptualizing Users as Social Actors in Information Systems Research." MIS Quarterly 27(2): 197-235.
- Laudon, K. C. and J. P. Laudon (2000). Management Information Systems: Organization and Technology in the Networked Enterprise. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger (1991). Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, A. S. (1989). "A Scientific Methodology for MIS Case Studies." MIS Quarterly (March): 33-50.
- Lee, A. S. (1999). "Rigor and Relevance in MIS Research: Beyond and Approach of Positivism Alone." MIS Quarterly 23(1): 29-34.
- Lee, B., A. Barua, et al. (1997). "Discovery and Representation of Causal Relationships in MIS Research: A Methodological Framework." MIS Quarterly (March): 109-136.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1995). Wellapings of Knowledge. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.
- Leonard, D. and S. Sensiper (1998). "The role of tacit knowledge in group innovation." California Management Review 40(3): 112-132.
- Lesser, E. L. (2000). Knowledge and Social Capital: Foundations and Applications, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lesser, E. L. (2000). Leveraging Social Capital in Organizations. Knowledge and Social Capital. E. L. Lesser, Butterworth-Heinemann: 3-16.
- Lewicki, R. J. and B. B. Bunker (1996). Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relationships. Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research. R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler. Thoisan Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, Inc.: 114 - 139.
- Lewis, W., R. Agarwal, et al. (2003). "Sources of Influence on Beliefs about Information Technology Use: An Empirical Study of Knowledge Workers." MIS Quarterly 27(4): 657-678.
- Liebowitz, J. (1999). Building Organizational intelligence: A knowledge Management Primer. Boca Raton, CRC Press LLC.
- Lin, N., K. Cook, et al. (2001). Social Capital: Theory and Research. New York, Aldine

De Gruyter.

- Lind, M. R. and R. W. Zmud (1995). "Improving Interorganizational Effectiveness through Voice Mail Facilitation of Peer-to-Peer Relationships." Organization Science 6(4): 445-461.
- Lucas, H. C., Jr. (1991). Methodological Issues in Information Systems Survey Research. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 273-285.
- Lucas, H. C. and V. K. Spitler (1999). "Technology Use and Performance: A Field Study of Broker Workstations." Decision Sciences 30(2): 291-311.
- Lucas, H. C. J. (1991). Commentary. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. 3: 67-69.
- Lucier, C. E. and J. D. Torsilieri (2001). Can Knowledge Management Deliver Bottom-line Results? Managing Industrial Knowledge: Creation, Transfer and Utilization. I. Nonaka and D. J. Teece, SAGE Publications: 231-243.
- Majchrzak, A., R. E. Rice, et al. (2000). "Technology Adaptation: The case of a computer-supported inter-organizational virtual team." MIS Quarterly 24(4): 569-600.
- Malafsky, G. P. (2003). Technology for Acquiring and sharing Knowledge Assets. Handbook on Knowledge Management 2 : Knowledge Directions. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer: 85-107.
- Malhotra, Y. (2001). From Information Management to Knowledge Management: Beyond the "Hi-Tech Hidebound" Systems. Knowledge Management and Business Model Innovation. Y. Malhotra. Hershey, PA, Idea Group Publishing: 113-134.
- Malhotra, Y. (2003). Why Knowledge Management Systems Fail: Enablers and Constraints of Knowledge Management in Human Enterprises. Handbook On Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer - Verlag. 1: 576-599.
- Markus, M. L. and A. S. Lee (1999). "Special Issue on Interpretive Research in Information Systems: Using Qualitative, Interpretive, and Case Methods to Study Information Technology -- Foreward." MIS Quarterly 23(1): 35-38.
- Mason, R. O. (1978). "Measuring Information Output: A Communication Systems

- Approach." Information & Management 1(5): 219-234.
- Mason, R. O., J. L. McKeen, et al. (1997). "An Historical Method for MIS Research: Steps and Assumptions." MIS Quarterly(September): 307-320.
- Mason, R. O., J. L. McKeen, et al. (1997). "Developing an Historical Tradition in MIS Research." MIS Quarterly(September): 257-278.
- McDermott, R. (1999). "Why Information Technology Inspired But Cannot Deliver Knowledge Management." California Management Review 41(4): 103 - 117.
- McDermott, R. (2000). "Knowing in Community: 10 Critical Success Factors in Building Communities of Practice." IHRIM Journal March.
- Melone, N. P. (1990). "A Theoretical Assessment of the User-satisfaction Construct in Information Systems Research." Management Science 36(1): 76-91.
- Mertins, K., P. Heisig, et al. (2001). Knowledge Management: Best Practice in Europe. Berlin, Springer.
- Mertins, K., P. Heisig, et al. (2003). Knowledge Management: Concepts and Best Practices. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- Meyerson, E. M. (1994). "Human Capital, Social Capital and Compensation: The Relative Contribution of Social Contacts to Managers' Incomes." Acta Sociologica 37: 383-399.
- Miller, F. J. (2002). "I=0 (Information has no intrinsic meaning)." Information Research 8(1): 140.
- Moffett, S., R. McAdam, et al. (2003). "Technology and people factors in knowledge management: an empirical analysis." Total Quality Management 14(2): 215-224.
- Monge, P. R. and N. S. Contractor (2001). Emergence of Communication Networks. The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, research, and Methods. F. M. Jablin and L. L. Putnam. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, Inc.: 440-502.
- Morris, T. (2001). "Asserting Property Rights: Knowledge Codification in the Professional Service." Human Relations 54(7): 819-838.
- Myers, B. L., L. A. Kappelman, et al. (1998). A Comprehensive Model for Assessing the Quality and Productivity of the Information Systems Function: Toward a Theory for Information Systems Assessment. Information Systems Success Measurement. E. J. Garritty and G. L. Sanders. Hershey, USA, London, UK, Idea Group Publishing: 94-121.
- Myers, M. D. (1997). "Qualitative Research in Information Systems." MIS

- Quarterly(June): 241-242.
- Nahapiet, J. and S. Ghoshal (1998). "Social capital, Intellectual capital and the organizational advantage." Academy of Management Review **23**(2): 242-266.
- Naito, H. (2001). Knowledge is Commitment. Managing Industrial Knowledge: Creation, Transfer and Utilization. I. Nonaka and D. J. Teece. London, SAGE Publications: 270-282.
- Nance, W. D. and D. W. Straub (1996). "An Investigation of Task-Technology Fit and Information Technology Choices in Knowledge Work." Journal of Information Technology Management **7**(3 & 4): 1-14.
- Newsted, P. R., S. L. Huff, et al. (1998). "Survey Instruments in Information Systems." MIS Quarterly (December): 553-554.
- Nickols, F., Ed. (2000). The Knowledge in Knowledge management. The Knowledge Management Yearbook 2000-2001, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Nielsen, B. and F. Ciabuschi (2003). "Simens ShareNet: Knowledge Management in practice." Business Strategy Review **14**(2): 33-40.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). "A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation." Organization Science **5**(1): 14-37.
- Nonaka, I. and P. Reinmoeller (2000). Dynamic Business Systems for Knowledge Creation and Utilization. Knowledge Horizons: The Present and the Promise of Knowledge Management. C. Despres and D. Chauvel, Butterworth-Heinemann: 89-112.
- Nonaka, I. and H. Takeuchi (1995). The Knowledge-Creating Company: How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation. New York, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Nonaka, I., R. Toyama, et al. (2001). SECI, Ba and Leadership: a Unified Model of Dynamic Knowledge Creation. Managing Industrial Knowledge: Creation, Transfer and Utilization. I. Nonaka and D. J. Teece. London, SAGE Publications: 13-43.
- Nonaka, I., R. Toyama, et al. (2000). "A Firm as a Knowledge-creating Entity: A New perspective on the Theory of the Firm." Industrial and Corporate Change **9**(1): 1-20.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric Theory. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- O'Dell, C. and C. J. Grayson, JR. (1998). If Only We Knew What We Know: The Transfer of Internal Knowledge and Best Practice. New York, The Free Press.

- Ogata, H., Y. Yano, et al. (2001). "Computer Supported Social Networking For Augmenting Cooperation." Computer Supported Cooperative Work **10**: 189-209.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). "The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations." Organization Science **3**(3): 398-427.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). "Using Technology and Constituting Structures: A Practice Lens for studying technology in organizations." Organization Science **11**(4): 404-428.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2002). "Knowing in Practice: Enacting a Collective Capability in Distributed Organizing." Organization Science **13**(3): 249-273.
- Orlikowski, W. J. and J. J. Baroudi (1991). "Studying Information Technology in Organizations: Research Approaches and Assumptions." Information Systems Research **2**(1): 1-28.
- Orlikowski, W. J. and D. Robey (1991). "Information Technology and the Structuring of Organizations." Information Systems Research **2**(2): 143-169.
- Palvia, P., E. Mao, et al. (2003). "Management Information Systems Research: What's There in a Methodology?" Communications of AIS **11**: 289-309.
- Pan, S. L. and H. Scarbrough (1998). "A Socio-Technical View of Knowledge-sharing at Buckman Laboratories." Journal of knowledge management **2**(1): 55-66.
- Pan, S. L. and H. Scarbrough (1999). "Knowledge management in Practice: An Exploratory Case Study." Technology Analysis & Strategic Management **11**(3): 359-374.
- Perry, C. (1998). "A Structured Approach for Presenting Thesis." Australasian Marketing Journal **6**(1): 63-85.
- Pfeffer, J. and R. I. Sutton (2000). The knowing-doing Gap: How smart Companies Turn Knowledge into Action. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1967). The Tacit Dimension. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Polanyi, M. (1969). Knowing and Being. London, Routledge and Kegan.
- Porter, L. W. (1991). Commentary. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. **3**: 287-289.
- Portes, A. (1998). "Social Capital: Its origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." Annual Review of Sociology **24**: 1-24.
- Poston, R. S. and C. Speier (2005). "Effective Use of Knowledge Management Systems: A Process Model of Content Ratings and Credibility Indicators." MIS Quarterly

29(2): 221-244.

- Prusak, L. (1997). Introduction to knowledge in organizations. Knowledge in Organizations. L. Prusak, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Prusak, L. (2001). "Where did Knowledge Management come from?" IBM Systems Journal 40(40): 1002-1007.
- Prusak, L. and D. Cohen (2001). "How to Invest in Social Capital." Harvard Business Review. June: 86-93.
- Quinn, J. B., Anderson, P. and Finkelstein, S. (1996). "Managing Professional Intellect: Making the Most of the Best." Harvard Business Review. (March-April).
- Reagans, R. and B. McEvily (2003). "Network Structure and Knowledge Transfer: The Effects of Cohesion and Range." Administrative Science Quarterly 48: 240-267.
- Roberts, K. H. and M. Grbowwski (1999). Organizations, Technology and Structuring. Managing organizations: Current Issues. S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. R. Nord, SAGE Publications: 159-173.
- Rogers, E. M. (1991). The "Critical Mass" in the Diffusion of Interactive Technologies in Organizations. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School. 3: 245-263.
- Rollo, C. and T. Clarke (2001). International Best Practice: Case Studies in Knowledge Management. Sydney, Standards Australia International.
- Ruggles, R. (1998). "The State of the Notion: Knowledge management in Practice." California Management Review 40(3): 80-89.
- Ryan, S. D. and D. A. Harrison (2000). "Considering Social Subsystem Costs and Benefits in Information Technology Investment Decisions: A view from the Field on Anticipated Payoffs." Journal of Management Information Systems 16(4): 11-40.
- Salisbury, W. D., W. w. Chin, et al. (2002). "Research Report: Better Theory Through Measurement -- Developing a Scale to Capture Consensus on Appropriation." Information Systems Research 13(1): 91-103.
- sarvary, M. (1999). "knowledge management and competition in the consulting industry." California Management Review 41: 95-107.
- Schriesheim, C. A., K. Powers, et al. (1993). "Improving Construct Measurement In Management Research: Comments and a Quantitative Approach for Assessing the Theoretical Content Adequacy of Paper-and-Pencil Survey-Type

- Instruments." Journal of Management 19(2): 385-417.
- Schultze, U. (2000). "A Confessional Account of an Ethnography about Knowledge Work." MIS Quarterly 24(1): 1-39.
- Schultze, U. (2003). On Knowledge Work. Handbook On Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin Heidelberg New York, Springer-Verlag. 1: 43-58.
- Schultze, U. and D. E. Leidner (2002). "Studying Knowledge Management in information Systems Research: Discourses and Theoretical Assumptions." MIS Quarterly 26(3): 243 - 268.
- Seddon, P. and M.-Y. Kiew (1994). A Partial Test and Development of the DeLone and McLean Model of IS Success. Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Information systems.
- Seibert, S. E., M. L. Kraimer, et al. (2001). "A Social Capital Theory of Career Success." Academy of Management Journal 44(2): 219-237.
- Sekaran, U. (1992). Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach, John Wiley & Sons, INC.
- Shannon, C. E. and W. Weaver (1949). The Mathematical theory of communication. Urbana, IL, University of Illinois Press.
- Shye, S., D. Elizur, et al. (1994). Introduction To Facet Theory: Content Design and Intrinsic Data Analysis in Behavioral Research, Sage Publications.
- Simsek, Z. and J. F. Veiga (2001). "A Primer on Internet Organizational Surveys." Organizational Research Methods 4(3): 218-235.
- Skyrme, D. J. (1999). Knowledge Networking: creating the collaborative Enterprise. Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Smith, H. A. and J. McKeen (2003). Creating and Facilitating Communities of Practice. Handbook on Knowledge Management 1: Knowledge Matters. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer: 393-407.
- Smith, H. A. and J. McKeen (2003). Knowledge Management in organizations: The State of Current Practice. Handbook on Knowledge Management: knowledge Directions. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer. 2: 395-410.
- Snow, C. C. and J. B. Thomas (1994). "Field research methods in strategic management: contributions to theory building and testing." Journal of Management Studies 31: 457-480.
- Sorenson, O. and T. E. Stuart (2001). "Syndication Networks and the Spatial

- Distribution of Venture Capital Investments." The American Journal of Sociology **106**(6): 1546-88.
- Spender, J.-C. (1996). "Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm." Strategic Management Journal **17**(Winter Special Issue): 45-62.
- Spender, J.-C. (1996). "Organizational knowledge, learning and memory: three concepts in search of a theory." Journal of Organizational Change Management **9**(1): 63-.
- Spender, J.-C. and M. R. Grant (1996). "Knowledge and the firm: overview." Strategic Management Journal **17**(Winter Special Issue): 5-9.
- Stanton, J. M. (1998). "An empirical assessment of data collection using the Internet." Personnel Psychology **51**: 709-725.
- Steffy, B. and A. J. Grimes (1986). "A Critical Theory of Organization Science." Academy of Management Review.
- Stein, E. W. and V. Zwass (1995). "Actualizing Organizational Memory with Information Systems." Information Systems Research **6**(2): 85-117.
- Straub, D. W. (1989). "Validating Instruments in MIS Research." MIS Quarterly(June): 147-169.
- Straub, D. W., M.-C. Boudreau, et al. (2004). "Validation Guidelines for IS Positivist Research." Communications of AIS **13**: 380-427.
- Straub, D. W. and E. Karahanna (1998). "Knowledge worker communications and recipient Availability: Toward a Task closure Explanation of Media Choice." Organization Science **9**(2): 160-175.
- Straub, D. W., M. Limayem, et al. (1995). "Measuring System Usage: Implications for IS Theory Testing." Management Science **41**(8): 1328-1342.
- Sudman, S. and N. M. Bradburn (1982). Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Sveiby, K.-E. (1997). The New Organizational Wealth: Managing & Measuring Knowledge-based Assets. San Francisco, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Sveiby, K.-E. (1999). Tacit Knowledge. The Knowledge Management Yearbook 1999-2000. J. W. a. W. Cortada, John A. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann: 18-27.
- Sveiby, K.-E. (2001). "A Knowledge-based theory of the firm to guide in Strategy formulation." Journal of Intellectual Capital **2**(4): 344-358.
- Sveiby, K.-E. and T. Lloyd (1987). Managing Know-how: Add value by Valuing Creativity. London, Bloomsbury.
- Sveiby, K.-E. and R. Simons (2002). "Collaborative Climate and Effectiveness of

- Knowledge Work." Journal of knowledge management 6(5).
- Swan, J. (2003). Knowledge Management in Action? Handbook on Knowledge Management. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Hong Kong, London, Milan, Paris, Tokyo, Springer. 1: 271 - 296.
- Szajna, B. (1996). "Empirical Evaluation of the Revised Technology Acceptance Model." Management Science 42(1): 85-92.
- Tabachnick, B. G. and L. S. Fidell (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics. New York, HarperCollins College Publishers.
- Tanriverdi, H. (2005). "Information Technology Relatedness, Knowledge Management Capability, And Performance of Multibusiness Firms." MIS Quarterly 29(2): 311-334.
- Taylor, B. C. and N. Trujillo (2001). Qualitative Research Methods. The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods. F. M. Jablin and L. L. Putnam. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, Inc.: 161-194.
- Taylor, J. C. and D. F. Felten (1993). Performance By Design: Sociotechnical Systems in North America. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Taylor, S. and P. A. Todd (1995). "Understanding Information Technology Usage: A Test of Competing Models." Information Systems Research 6(2): 144-176.
- Teece, D. J. (1998). "Capturing Value from Knowledge Assets: The New Economy, Markets For Know-how, and Intangible Assets." California Management Review 40(3): 55-79.
- Teo, H. H., K. K. Wei, et al. (2003). "Predicting Intention to Adopt Interorganizational Linkages: An Institutional Perspective." MIS Quarterly 27(1): 19-49.
- Thomas, J. C., W. A. Kellogg, et al. (2001). "The Knowledge Management Puzzle: Human and Social Factors in Knowledge Management." IBM Systems Journal 40(4): 863-884.
- Tiwana, A. (2000). The Knowledge Management Toolkit: Practical Techniques for building a knowledge management system. Upper Saddle River, Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Tsai, W. and S. Ghoshal (1998). "Social Capital and Value Creation: The role of Intrafirm networks." Academy of Management Journal 41(4): 464 - 476.
- Tsoukas, H. (1996). "The firm as a distributed knowledge system: A constructionist approach." Strategic Management Journal 17(Winter Special Issue): 11-25.

- Tsoukas, H. (2000). "Knowledge as Action, Organization as Theory: Reflections on Organizational knowledge." Emergence 2(4): 104-112.
- Tsoukas, H. (2003). Do We Really Understand Tacit Knowledge? The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management. M. Easterby-Smith and M. A. Lyles. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 410-427.
- Tsoukas, H. and E. Vladimirou (2001). "What is Organizational Knowledge." Journal of Management Studies 38(7): 973-994.
- Tsui, E. (2003). Tracking the role and evolution of commercial knowledge management software. Handbook on knowledge management : knowledge Directions. C. W. Holsapple. Berlin, Springer-Verlag. 2: 5-28.
- Turban, E. (1992). Expert Systems and Applied Artificial Intelligence, Macmillan.
- Van Wijk, R., F. A. J. Van Den Bosch, et al. (2003). Knowledge and Networks. The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management. M. Easterby-Smith and M. A. Lyles. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 428-453.
- Venkatesh, V. and F. D. Davis (2000). "A Theoretical Extension of the Technology Acceptance Model: Four Longitudinal Field Studies." Management Science 46(2): 186-204.
- Venkatesh, V., M. G. Morris, et al. (2003). "User Acceptance of Information Technology: Toward a Unified View." MIS Quarterly 27(3): 425-478.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). "The Concept of Fit in Strategy Research: Toward Verbal and Statistical Correspondence." Academy of Management Review 14(3): 423-444.
- Verwijs, C., I. Mulder, et al. (2002). Leveraging Communities with new technologies. Support for Knowledge sharing in Communities. J. H. E. Andriessen, M. Soekijad and H. J. Keasberry. Delft, Delft University Press: 57-70.
- Vitalari, N. P. (1991). Longitudinal Surveys in Information Systems: An Examination of Issues, Methods, and Applications. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School. 3: 115-143.
- von Krogh, G. (1998). "Care in Knowledge Creation." California Management Review 40(3): 133-153.
- Von Krogh, G., K. Ichijo, et al. (2000). Enabling Knowledge Creation. New York, Oxford University Press.

- Wagner, C. (2004). "WIKI: A Technology for Conversational Knowledge Management and Group Collaboration." Communications of the AIS **13**: 265-289.
- Walker, G., B. Kogut, et al. (2000). Social Capital, Structural Holes and the Formation of an Industry Network. Knowledge and Social Capital. E. L. Lesser, Butterworth-Heinemann: 225-254.
- Walsh, J. P. and G. R. Ungson (1991). "Organizational Memory." Academy of Management Review **16**(1): 57-91.
- Walsham, G. (2001). "Knowledge Management: The Benefits and Limitations of Computer Systems." European Management Journal **19**(6): 599 - 608.
- Wang, F. and J. Plaskoff (2002). An integrated development model for KM. Knowledge Management Strategy and Technology. R. F. Bellaver and J. M. Lusa. Norwood, MA, Artech House, Inc.: 113-134.
- Wasserman, S. and K. Faust (1994). Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications, Cambridge University Press.
- Watson, R. T. (1999). Data Management: Databases and Organizations. New York, John Wiley.
- Wellman, B. (1996). For a Social Network Analysis of Computer Networks: A Sociological Perspective on Collaborative Work and Virtual Community. Proceedings of SIGCPR/SIGMIS, Denver, Colorado, USA, ACM Press.
- Wellman, B. (2001). "Computer networks as social networks." Science **293**(14): 2031-2034.
- Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and identity. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2001). "Supporting Communities of Practice: A Survey of Community-oriented Technologies." Retrieved October 2001, 2001, from [Http://www.ewenger.com](http://www.ewenger.com).
- Wenger, E., R. McDermott, et al. (2002). Cultivating Communities of Practice. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Wenger, E. and W. M. Snyder (2000). "Communities of Practice: The Organizational Frontier." Harvard Business Review. **January-February**: 139-145.
- West, S. G., J. F. Finch, et al. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and Remedies. Structural Equation Modeling. R. H. Hoyle. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications: 56-75.
- Westland, J. C. (2004). "The IS Core XII: Authority, Dogma and Positive Science in

- Information Systems Research." Communications of AIS **13**: 136-157.
- Wiig, K. M. (2000). Knowledge Management: An Emerging Discipline Rooted in a Long History. Knowledge Horizons: The Present and Promise of Knowledge Management. C. Despres and D. Chauvel. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann: 3-26.
- Wilson, T. D. (2002). "The nonsense of 'Knowledge management'." Information Research **8**(1): No. 144.
- Yi, J. Q. (2002). Facilitating Learning and Knowledge creation in community of practice: A case study in a corporate learning Environment. Knowledge management in the SocioTechnical World: The Graffiti Continues. E. Coakes, D. Willis and S. Clarke. London, Springer-Verlag: 105-120.
- Yi, M. Y. and F. D. Davis (2003). "Developing and Validating an Observational Learning Model of Computer Software Training and Skill Acquisition." Information Systems Research **14**(2): 146-169.
- Yli-Renko, H., E. Autio, et al. (2001). "Social Capital, Knowledge Acquisition, and Knowledge Exploitation in Young Technology-Based Firms." Strategic Management Journal **22**: 587-613.
- Yoo, Y. and C. Ifvarsson (2001). Knowledge Dynamics in Organizations. Knowledge Management in the SocioTechnical World: The Graffiti Continues. E. Coakes, D. Willis and S. Clarke. London, Springer-Verlag: 220.
- Yung, Y.-F. and W. Chan (1999). Statistical Analyses Using Bootstrapping: Concepts and Implementation. Statistical Strategies for Small Sample Research. R. H. Hoyle, Sage Publications, Inc.: 81-105.
- Zack, M. H. (1998). "An Architecture for Managing Explicated Knowledge." Sloan Management Review **September**.
- Zack, M. H. (1999). "Managing Codified knowledge." Sloan Management Review **40**(4): 45-51.
- Zack, M. H. and M. Serino (2000). Knowledge Management and Collaboration Technologies. Knowledge, Groupware and the Internet. D. E. Smith. Woburn, MA, Butterworth-Heinemann: 303-315.
- Zigurs, L. and B. K. Buckland (1998). "A Theory of Task/Technology Fit and Group Support Systems Effectiveness." MIS Quarterly **September 1998**: 313-334.
- Zigurs, L., B. K. Buckland, et al. (1999). "A Test of Task-Technology Fit Theory for Group Support Systems." The DATA BASE for Advances in information

Systems **30**(3,4): 34-50.

Zikmund, W. G. (2000). Business Research Methods, The Dryden Press, Harcourt College Publishers.

Zmud, R. W. and A. C. Boynton (1991). Survey Measures and Instruments in MIS: Inventory and Appraisal. The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods. K. L. Kraemer. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press. **3**: 149-180.

8 Appendix

Appendix I: Survey Package for Preliminary Study

▪ Invitation Email

Dear XXX

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation and conducting an online survey on knowledge management technologies/systems 'impacts on Social Capital as a part of my doctoral research.

I need your help in participating in my online survey. The Survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

You are invited for the survey by following reasons:

- You are current working for a knowledge-intensive organization, such as University;
- You are assumed to have experience in using at least one of following technologies:
 - Email
 - Intranet/Internet
 - Online Discussion Forum

I believe that you will have no problems to answer these questions without knowing 'knowledge management', 'knowledge management technologies/systems', and 'Social capital'.

Your participation and inputs are very important to me. To participate in the survey please go to:

http://www.gsm.mq.edu.au/facultyhome/ernest.jordan/Esheng/Online%20Survey%20Package/Front_Page_Survey.htm

The survey, approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee (Human Research), is completely confidential.

A brief description about this research is available through the above URL. A copy of the results will be available on request from me.

I am grateful if you could complete the questionnaire by 10 June 2003.

I appreciate your time and attention to this survey.

Sincerely yours

▪ Online Invitation Letter

An Invitation

Dear Participants,

You are invited to participate in a study to examine Knowledge Management Systems' impacts on Social Capital. This survey takes around 15 minutes to complete.

In this study, Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) refer to a class of computer-based information systems specifically for information/knowledge storage and exchange, and for people communication and interaction. KMS may comprise Email, Intranet, Groupware/Lotus Notes, Knowledge Ports, Video-conferencing, Document Management/Knowledge Bases, etc.

This survey is designed to collect data on how you use your organization's KMS to share information, communicate and collaborate with other people in your organization to develop and maintain Social Capital.

This study is being conducted by Esheng Wang, a PhD student at Macquarie University Graduate School of Management as a part of his doctoral research being conducted to meet the requirements for the degree under the supervision of Professor Ernest Jordan at Macquarie Graduate School of Management.

There are no known risks to participate in this study. Your individual identity and responses to all the questions will be kept completely confidential. Responses will be summarized to reflect group rather than individual opinions. Only the researcher and his supervisor will have access to your responses.

If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw from further participation in the research at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, Please feel free to contact me by email at Esheng@skaglobal.com, by phone/fax at +61 2 9889 5727, mobile at 0403 102 823. Alternatively, you can contact Professor Ernest Jordan, my supervisor, by email at Ernie.Jordan@gsm.mq.edu.au, by phone at +61 2 9850 9041.

A copy of the results will be available on request from the researcher.

Note: The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee (Human Research). If you have any complaints or reservations about my ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Ethics Review Committee through its Secretary (telephone 02 9850 7854). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate and for your valuable input.

▪ Survey Instruction

Instructions

This survey contains 59 questions across 9 sections, and should take about 15 minutes to complete.

All the questions are multiple choice as "Radio Button", or " Pull-Down Menu" format. Answer questions by checking the buttons/items most applicable to you.

The questions in this survey assume that you are regularly using *one or more* computer-based information systems of your organization's KMS in your current job for exchanging information, communicating, and collaborating and/or cooperating with other people within your organization. Your organization's KMS may comprise *one or more* of the following computer-based information systems:

- Email
- Intranet
- Document Management/Knowledge bases
- Groupware/Lotus Notes
- Video Conferencing
- Knowledge Portals
- Yellow pages (i.e., Locating and accessing to experts and/or expertise)

If you **NEVER** use *any* of the above-mentioned systems within your current organization, please click

the (exit) button.

Otherwise, Please click (continue) Button now.

▪ **Reminder Letter**

Dear XXX

This survey is to be closed in two days. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your great support. As the number of responses is insufficient to conduct statistical analysis, I still need your help.

Should you have already completed the online survey, please disregard this email. If you haven't got chance to look at my survey, I would be grateful if you could give me a hand by clicking the URL as follows. It will take only 15 minutes to complete this survey. I understand you have a very busy schedule. However, your support would be of great benefit for this research.

http://www.gsm.mq.edu.au/facultyhome/ernest.jordan/Esheng/Online%20Survey%20Package/Front_Page_Survey.htm

Sincerely yours,

▪ Survey Questionnaire

Knowledge Management Systems Effect on Social Capital

(NB: the Items with '*' are retained after pilot study.)

Please answer the following questions by checking the buttons/items most applicable to you.

Section I

1. How Long have you been using the KMS within the current organization?

Section II

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. I find it easy to get my KMS to do what I want it to do. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. I feel very comfortable using my KMS. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. My KMS is very important in performing my job. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Because of information/knowledge I now get through my KMS, my decision-making is far more effective. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. My KMS is very reliable (i.e., does not go down)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. It is easy to get assistance when I am having trouble using my KMS.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section III

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
8. My colleagues strongly support my using our KMS. *	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. I would like very much to use our KMS because colleagues think I should use it. *							
10. Senior management strongly supports my using our KMS. *							
11. I would like very much to use our KMS because senior management thinks I should use it. *							

Section IV

Please indicate the extent to which you use KMS in the following areas.

	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Much	A great deal	N/A
12. I use the KMS to access online documents /knowledge repositories. *						
13. I use the KMS to distribute information.*						
14. I use the KMS to search people for information/expertise. *						
15. I use the KMS to identify people who share similar interests with me.						
16. I use the KMS to maintain communication with colleagues.						
17. I use the KMS to participate in online discussion forums.						
18. I use the KMS to engage in virtual (online) communities. *						
19. I use the KMS to discuss ideas, and/or exchange views/experience with colleagues. *						
20. I use the KMS to collaborate with colleagues. *						
21. I use the KMS to cooperate with colleagues. *						

Section V

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
22. My KMS helps me expand connections with people in my organization.							
23. My KMS helps me make more acquaintances in my organization. *							
24. My KMS helps me make more friends in my organization. *							

25. My KMS helps me and my friend maintain a close relationship.							
26. I can rely on the colleagues whom I get to know through my KMS without any fear that they will take advantage of me, even if the opportunity arises. *							
27. In general, I find the colleagues whom I turn to for help through my KMS always keep the promises they make to me. *							
28. I find the friends I made through my KMS are trustworthy.							
29. My KMS helps me and colleagues share same ambitions and vision. *							
30. My KMS helps me and colleagues keep pursuing the collective goals and mission of the whole organization. *							

Section VI

Please indicate the extent to which you use the following functions of your KMS:

	Extremely light	Fairly light	Neutral	Fairly heavy	Extremely heavy	N/A
31. E-mail						
32. Video Conferencing						
33. Documents/knowledge repositories						
34. Information/knowledge distribution						
35. Locating/Accessing to expertise and/or experts (i.e., Yellow pages)						
36. Online discussion forums						
37. Virtual (online) communities						
38. Virtual (online) collaboration and/or cooperation.						

Section VII

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements about the information/knowledge services of your KMS.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
39. The information/knowledge is accurate enough for my							

purposes.*							
40. I can't get information/knowledge that is current enough to meet my needs.							
41. The information/knowledge is up-to-date enough for my purposes.*							
42. The information/knowledge has sufficient details for my purposes.*							
43. It is easy to locate information/knowledge on a particular issue, even if I haven't used that information/knowledge before.*							
44. It is easy to locate people with the needed expertise.*							
45. It is easy to locate people with the needed information.*							
46. It is easy to get access to information/knowledge that I need.*							
47. I can get information/knowledge quickly and easily when I need it.*							
48. It is easy to get assistance when I am having trouble finding and using information/knowledge.*							
49. I am getting the help I need in accessing and understanding information/knowledge.*							

Section VIII: Personal and Organizational information

50. Your gender

51. Your age

52. Number of years with current organization:

53. Your job title:

54. Number of years in current position:

55. How would you classify your position?

--	--

56. Your highest educational degree obtained:

--	--

57. The industry you work for:

Downloaded from <http://ajph.org/> on November 10, 2014

58. Your organization size (i.e. the number of employees):

59. What is the geographic nature of your organization?

--	--

Section IX: Comments

60. Please feel free to add any additional comments.

Submit Your Responses

Reset All Response

Appendix II: Survey Package for Formal Study

▪ Invitation Email

Dear XXX,

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation and conducting an online survey on knowledge management technologies/systems 'impacts on Social Capital as a part of my doctoral research.

I need your help in participating in my online survey. The Survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

You are invited for the survey by following reasons:

- You are current working for a knowledge-intensive organization;
- You are assumed to have experience in using at least one of following technologies:
 - Email
 - Intranet
 - Online Discussion Forum
 - Groupware

I believe that you will have no problems to answer these questions without knowing 'knowledge management', 'knowledge management technologies/systems', and 'Social capital'.

Your participation and inputs are very important to me. To participate in the survey please go to:

http://www.gsm.mq.edu.au/facultyhome/ernest.jordan/Esheng/surveys/km/Front_Page_Survey_new.htm

The survey, approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee (Human Research), is completely confidential.

A brief description about this research is available through the above URL. A copy of the results will be available on request from me.

I am grateful if you could complete the questionnaire by 2 September 2003.

I appreciate your time and attention to this survey.

Sincerely yours,

▪ Online Invitation Letter

An Invitation

Dear Participants,

You are invited to participate in a study to examine **Knowledge Management Systems'** impacts on **Social Capital**. This survey takes around 15 minutes to complete.

In this study, Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) refer to a class of computer-based information systems specifically for information/knowledge storage and exchange, and for people communication and interaction. KMS may comprise Email, Intranet, Groupware/Lotus Notes, Knowledge Ports, Video-conferencing, Document Management/Knowledge Bases, etc.

This survey is designed to collect data on how you use your organization's **KMS** to share information, communicate and collaborate with other people in your organization to develop and maintain **Social Capital**.

This study is being conducted by Esheng Wang, a PhD student at Macquarie University Graduate School of Management as a part of his doctoral research being conducted to meet the requirements for the degree under the supervision of Professor Ernest Jordan at Macquarie Graduate School of Management.

There are no known risks to participate in this study. Your individual identity and responses to all the questions will be kept completely confidential. Responses will be summarized to reflect group rather than individual opinions. Only the researcher and his supervisor will have access to your responses.

If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw from further participation in the research at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, Please feel free to contact me by email at Esheng@skaglobal.com, by phone/fax at +61 2 9889 5727, mobile at 0403 102 823. Alternatively, you can contact Professor Ernest Jordan, my supervisor, by email at Ernie.Jordan@gsm.mq.edu.au, by phone at +61 2 9850 9041.

A copy of the results will be available on request from the researcher.

Note: The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee (Human Research). If you have any complaints or reservations about my ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Ethics Review Committee through its Secretary (telephone 02 9850 7854). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate and for your valuable input.

▪ Survey Instruction

Instructions

Your organization's KMS may comprise *one or more* of the following computer-based information systems:

- **Email**
- **Intranet**
- **Document Management/Knowledge bases**
- **Groupware/Lotus Notes**
- **Video Conferencing**
- **Knowledge Portals**
- **Yellow pages (i.e., Locating and accessing to experts and/or expertise)**

If you **NEVER** use *any* of the above-mentioned systems within your current organization,

please click the button to exit. **Otherwise**, Please

click (continue) Button now.

▪ **Reminder Letter**

Dear XXX,

This survey is to be closed in two days. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your great support. As the number of responses is insufficient to conduct statistical analysis, I still need your help.

Should you have already completed the online survey, please disregard this email. If you haven't got chance to look at my survey, I would be grateful if you could give me a hand by clicking the **URL** as follows. It will take only 15 minutes to complete this survey. I understand you have a very busy schedule. However, your support would be of great benefit for this research.

http://www.gsm.mq.edu.au/facultyhome/ernest.jordan/Esheng/surveys/km/Front_Page_Survey_new.htm

Sincerely yours,

■ Survey Questionnaire

KMS effects on Social Capital

(NB: the Items with '**' are retained after validation.)

Instructions

This survey contains 55 questions across 9 sections, and should take about 15 minutes to complete.

All the questions are multiple choice as "Radio Button", or " Pull-Down Menu" format. Please answer questions by checking the buttons/items most applicable to you. Top of Form

Section I

1. How Long have you been using the KMS within the current organization?

<Select>

Section II

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2. I feel very comfortable using the KMS. (EOU1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I find it easy to get the KMS to do what I want it to do. (EOU2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. The KMS is very important in performing my job. (PU1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Because of information/knowledge I now get through the KMS, my problem-solving/decision-making is far more effective. (PU2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section III

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
6. My colleagues strongly support my using the KMS.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(NORM1)*							
7. Senior management strongly supports my using the KMS. (NORM2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I would like very much to use the KMS because colleagues think I should use it. (NORM3)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I would like very much to use the KMS because senior management thinks I should use it. (NORM4)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section IV

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements about the information/knowledge services of your KMS:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
10. The information/knowledge is accurate enough for my purposes. (INFO_C1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. It is easy to get assistance when I am having trouble finding and using information/knowledge. (INFO_S1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. The information/knowledge is up-to-date enough for my purposes. (INFO_C2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. It is easy to locate information/knowledge on a particular issue, even if I haven't used that information/knowledge before. (INFO_S2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. I can get information/knowledge quickly and easily when I need it. (INFO_S3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. It is easy to locate people with the needed expertise. (INFO_S4)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. The information/knowledge has sufficient details for my purposes. (INFO_C3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. I am getting the help I need in accessing and understanding information/knowledge. (INFO_S5)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. It is easy to get access to information/knowledge that I need. (INFO_S6)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. It is easy to locate people with the needed information. (INFO_S7)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section V

Please indicate the extent to which you use KMS in the following areas:

	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Much	A great deal
20. I use the KMS to access online documents /knowledge repositories. (INFO_U1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. I use the KMS to cooperate with colleagues. (CC_U1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. I use the KMS to distribute information. (INFO_U2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
23. I use the KMS to discuss ideas, and/or exchange views/experience with colleagues. (CC_U2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. I use the KMS to search for people who might have the information/expertise I need. (INFO_U3)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. I use the KMS to collaborate with colleagues. (CC_U3)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. I use the KMS to seek work-related information and advice. (INFO_U4)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. I use the KMS to maintain communication with colleagues (CC_U4)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section VI

Please indicate your reactions to the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
28. The KMS helps me expand connections with people (i.e., have more acquaintances and friends) in my organization. (SC_N1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29. The KMS helps expand my advice-network within the organization, from whom I can regularly seek work-related information and advice. (SC_N2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. The KMS enhances my understanding of colleagues' knowledge and skills. (SC_T1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. The KMS improves experience sharing between colleagues and me. (SC_T2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. The KMS enhances the mutual understanding between colleagues and me (i.e., through online information, communication & interaction). (SC_T3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

33. The KMS helps me maintain regular communications with some colleagues. (SC_T4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. Because of the information and experience I get through the KMS, I feel that I can rely on those from whom I seek work-related information and advice. (SC_T5)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35. Overall, the KMS improves trust levels between colleagues and me. (SC_T6)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36. The KMS helps me and colleagues share same ambitions and vision (i.e., through online information, communication and interaction). (SC_V1)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. The KMS helps me and colleagues keep pursuing the collective goals and mission of the whole organization (i.e., through online information, communication and interaction). (SC_V2)*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section VII

Please indicate the extent to which you use the following functions of your KMS:

	N/A	Extremely light	Fairly light	Moderately	Fairly heavy	Extremely heavy
38. E-mail	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39. Video conferencing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. Shared documents/knowledge repositories	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41. Information/knowledge distribution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42. Expert locators (i.e. an application of your KMS that tracks the expertise of staff and provide contact information)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. Online discussion forums	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. Virtual(online) communities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. Virtual teams/collaboration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Section VIII: Personal and Organizational information

46. Your gender

<Select>

47. Your age

48. Number of years with current organization

49. Your job title

50. How would classify your position?

51. Your highest educational degree obtained:

52. The industry you work for

53. The size of your division (i.e. the number of staff in your department)

54. The size of your organization (i.e., the number of employees in your organization)

55. What is the geographic nature of your organization?

Section IX: Comments

56. Please feel free to add any additional comments.

Appendix III: Sample Statistics

▪ Descriptive Statistics for Measurement Items

Scale	Variable	Mean	St. Dev.	T-Value	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min.	Freq.	Max.	Freq.
EOU	EOU1	6.254	0.863	137.945	-1.973	6.013	2.000	3	7.000	152
	EOU2	5.740	1.103	98.974	-1.449	2.495	1.000	1	7.000	75
PU	PU1	6.417	0.781	156.395	-1.690	4.132	2.000	1	7.000	199
	PU2	5.773	1.068	102.896	-1.035	1.400	1.000	1	7.000	93
NORMS_S	NORM1	5.994	1.063	107.284	-1.408	2.555	1.000	2	7.000	129
	NORM2	6.086	1.064	108.868	-1.589	3.006	1.000	1	7.000	148
NORMS_W	NORM3	4.276	1.611	50.518	-0.212	-0.510	1.000	22	7.000	31
	NORM4	4.345	1.668	49.579	-0.263	-0.641	1.000	24	7.000	34
IINFO_C	INFO C1	5.533	0.996	105.700	-1.192	1.859	1.000	1	7.000	35
	INFO C2	5.285	1.216	82.693	-1.071	0.835	1.000	1	7.000	33
	INFO C3	5.207	1.213	81.653	-0.908	0.473	1.000	2	7.000	30
INFO_S	INFO S1	4.901	1.463	63.742	-0.601	-0.386	1.000	6	7.000	39
	INFO S2	5.075	1.359	71.031	-1.054	0.574	1.000	6	7.000	26
	INFO S3	5.265	1.307	76.655	-1.100	0.840	1.000	4	7.000	40
	INFO S4	4.859	1.388	66.591	-0.633	-0.231	1.000	5	7.000	27
	INFO S5	4.986	1.286	73.776	-0.768	0.090	1.000	3	7.000	22
	INFO S6	5.204	1.192	83.076	-0.934	0.590	1.000	2	7.000	28
	INFO S7	4.878	1.288	72.078	-0.617	-0.238	1.000	2	7.000	20
Info_Use	INFO U1	4.017	0.996	76.751	-0.863	0.155	1.000	6	5.000	139
	INFO U2	4.287	0.900	90.680	-1.126	0.472	1.000	1	5.000	191
	INFO U3	3.398	1.110	58.245	-0.064	-0.952	1.000	10	5.000	73
	INFO U4	4.080	0.869	89.321	-0.818	0.244	1.000	1	5.000	127
CC_Use	CC U1	4.193	0.936	85.214	-0.985	0.196	1.000	2	5.000	173
	CC U2	3.865	1.029	71.446	-0.554	-0.521	1.000	5	5.000	121
	CC U3	3.989	0.953	79.627	-0.673	-0.218	1.000	3	5.000	129
	CC U4	4.207	0.964	83.038	-1.097	0.355	1.000	2	5.000	179
SC_N	SC N1	5.624	1.197	89.428	-1.057	1.011	1.000	1	7.000	82
	SC N2	5.511	1.158	90.514	-0.935	0.688	2.000	8	7.000	62
SC_T	SC T1	5.022	1.323	72.226	-0.806	0.345	1.000	5	7.000	31
	SC T2	5.414	1.211	85.032	-0.903	0.796	1.000	2	7.000	60
	SC T3	5.381	1.195	85.688	-0.985	1.219	1.000	4	7.000	50
	SC T4	5.970	0.991	114.589	-1.449	3.218	1.000	1	7.000	110
	SC T5	5.249	1.204	82.917	-0.708	0.590	1.000	3	7.000	46
	SC T6	4.898	1.310	71.152	-0.331	-0.273	1.000	2	7.000	39
SC_V	SC V1	4.873	1.327	69.842	-0.665	0.313	1.000	7	7.000	28
	SC V2	5.262	1.340	74.728	-0.926	0.756	1.000	6	7.000	57
Function-related Use of KMS	EMAIL U	4.699	0.527	169.712	-1.536	1.452	3.000	12	5.000	265
	VCONF_U	1.177	1.208	18.537	0.813	-0.227	0.000	137	5.000	2
	KR U	3.677	1.022	68.438	-0.712	0.261	0.000	1	5.000	75
	IKD U	3.682	1.158	60.478	-1.024	1.275	0.000	10	5.000	96
	EL U	1.843	1.464	23.941	0.211	-0.995	0.000	97	5.000	13
	ODF U	2.511	1.485	32.165	-0.045	-0.962	0.000	38	5.000	36
	VCOM U	1.713	1.524	21.386	0.461	-0.890	0.000	110	5.000	17
	VT U	1.934	1.617	22.747	0.286	-1.122	0.000	101	5.000	26

▪ Covariance Matrix of Measurement Items

	EOU1	EOU2	PU1	PU2	NORM1	NORM2
EOU1	0.744					
EOU2	0.623	1.218				
PU1	0.293	0.355	0.609			
PU2	0.440	0.600	0.394	1.140		
NORM1	0.475	0.555	0.371	0.461	1.130	
NORM2	0.363	0.432	0.263	0.344	0.798	1.131
NORM3	0.140	0.202	0.084	0.340	0.522	0.444
NORM4	0.142	0.259	0.088	0.342	0.445	0.477
INFO C1	0.402	0.546	0.245	0.429	0.410	0.372
INFO C2	0.387	0.567	0.330	0.455	0.459	0.463
INFO C3	0.343	0.586	0.334	0.476	0.469	0.389
INFO S1	0.419	0.694	0.319	0.531	0.553	0.532
INFO S2	0.391	0.817	0.315	0.543	0.446	0.398
INFO S3	0.392	0.714	0.291	0.573	0.439	0.401
INFO S4	0.296	0.595	0.258	0.514	0.503	0.444
INFO S5	0.292	0.559	0.244	0.423	0.490	0.508
INFO S6	0.369	0.665	0.302	0.553	0.494	0.440
INFO S7	0.358	0.567	0.256	0.507	0.545	0.545
INFO U1	0.237	0.312	0.251	0.275	0.310	0.223
INFO U2	0.209	0.219	0.293	0.237	0.276	0.297
INFO U3	0.220	0.311	0.233	0.268	0.238	0.179
INFO U4	0.232	0.259	0.194	0.254	0.239	0.212
CC U1	0.203	0.275	0.312	0.196	0.333	0.341
CC U2	0.239	0.325	0.270	0.280	0.318	0.308
CC U3	0.274	0.296	0.293	0.280	0.377	0.289
CC U4	0.208	0.217	0.276	0.266	0.334	0.328
SC N1	0.320	0.381	0.337	0.449	0.438	0.381
SC N2	0.327	0.388	0.326	0.473	0.418	0.383
SC T1	0.202	0.272	0.301	0.346	0.269	0.256
SC T2	0.227	0.349	0.303	0.451	0.346	0.322
SC T3	0.235	0.315	0.298	0.463	0.357	0.352
SC T4	0.240	0.236	0.259	0.292	0.352	0.310
SC T5	0.178	0.333	0.300	0.458	0.348	0.353
SC T6	0.159	0.220	0.251	0.467	0.296	0.230
SC V1	0.193	0.277	0.239	0.495	0.315	0.271
SC V2	0.313	0.287	0.333	0.572	0.453	0.404
EMAIL_U	0.071	0.110	0.098	0.073	0.073	0.073
VCONF_U	-0.012	0.007	-0.007	-0.087	-0.043	-0.087
KR_U	0.298	0.345	0.229	0.312	0.331	0.288
IKD_U	0.250	0.397	0.222	0.285	0.259	0.202
EL_U	0.132	0.352	0.168	0.330	0.132	0.038
ODF_U	0.177	0.283	0.146	0.249	0.097	0.086
VCOM_U	0.118	0.238	0.076	0.134	-0.027	-0.050
VT_U	0.139	0.207	0.166	0.168	0.110	0.119

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	NORM3	NORM4	INFO C1	INFO C2	INFO C3	INFO S1
NORM3	2.594					
NORM4	2.414	2.781				
INFO C1	0.298	0.328	0.992			
INFO C2	0.295	0.309	0.734	1.478		
INFO C3	0.286	0.333	0.706	0.935	1.472	
INFO S1	0.363	0.342	0.688	1.003	0.866	2.140
INFO S2	0.223	0.190	0.583	0.898	0.968	1.135
INFO S3	0.348	0.349	0.664	0.858	0.967	0.974
INFO S4	0.601	0.514	0.505	0.749	0.927	1.130
INFO S5	0.411	0.492	0.509	0.730	0.864	1.193
INFO S6	0.245	0.242	0.589	0.759	0.902	0.921
INFO S7	0.618	0.571	0.522	0.724	0.912	1.038
INFO U1	-0.054	0.005	0.166	0.197	0.243	0.317
INFO U2	0.109	0.200	0.101	0.140	0.181	0.223
INFO U3	0.136	0.197	0.183	0.230	0.352	0.447
INFO U4	0.138	0.205	0.218	0.265	0.310	0.418
CC U1	0.193	0.296	0.154	0.225	0.234	0.321
CC U2	0.334	0.343	0.219	0.230	0.349	0.416
CC U3	0.319	0.389	0.211	0.280	0.304	0.301
CC U4	0.161	0.166	0.188	0.212	0.295	0.281
SC N1	0.317	0.371	0.453	0.467	0.541	0.633
SC N2	0.343	0.427	0.433	0.419	0.536	0.591
SC T1	0.299	0.377	0.315	0.243	0.594	0.506
SC T2	0.334	0.397	0.302	0.350	0.534	0.424
SC T3	0.354	0.400	0.314	0.370	0.511	0.473
SC T4	0.211	0.232	0.335	0.322	0.400	0.302
SC T5	0.565	0.618	0.382	0.430	0.561	0.557
SC T6	0.596	0.648	0.304	0.359	0.442	0.430
SC V1	0.639	0.687	0.317	0.419	0.522	0.583
SC V2	0.531	0.607	0.466	0.510	0.605	0.638
EMAIL U	0.006	0.016	0.036	0.050	0.076	0.106
VCONF U	-0.027	0.019	-0.036	0.016	0.002	0.051
KR U	0.101	0.131	0.242	0.272	0.272	0.383
IKD U	0.024	0.093	0.319	0.315	0.462	0.359
EL U	0.224	0.318	0.115	0.125	0.304	0.375
ODF U	-0.144	-0.124	0.090	0.187	0.268	0.242
VCOM U	0.069	0.116	-0.013	0.049	0.195	0.273
VT U	0.221	0.336	0.132	0.166	0.233	0.342

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	INFO S2	INFO S3	INFO S4	INFO S5	INFO S6	INFO S7
INFO S2	1.848					
INFO S3	1.368	1.708				
INFO S4	1.124	1.037	1.927			
INFO S5	0.863	0.849	1.053	1.654		
INFO S6	1.109	1.153	0.993	0.956	1.421	
INFO S7	0.968	0.971	1.484	1.070	1.086	1.658
INFO U1	0.384	0.339	0.241	0.202	0.401	0.265
INFO U2	0.247	0.264	0.187	0.228	0.268	0.232
INFO U3	0.510	0.398	0.538	0.396	0.481	0.564
INFO U4	0.396	0.367	0.338	0.336	0.424	0.386
CC U1	0.287	0.281	0.274	0.291	0.307	0.334
CC U2	0.453	0.429	0.396	0.433	0.443	0.416
CC U3	0.355	0.369	0.361	0.360	0.423	0.428
CC U4	0.289	0.305	0.320	0.241	0.265	0.338
SC N1	0.513	0.482	0.570	0.499	0.559	0.608
SC N2	0.535	0.490	0.618	0.583	0.566	0.658
SC T1	0.577	0.473	0.477	0.435	0.433	0.526
SC T2	0.520	0.519	0.491	0.538	0.480	0.538
SC T3	0.545	0.552	0.494	0.504	0.520	0.556
SC T4	0.326	0.346	0.336	0.254	0.314	0.365
SC T5	0.566	0.554	0.561	0.546	0.428	0.615
SC T6	0.431	0.457	0.415	0.433	0.412	0.503
SC V1	0.530	0.541	0.544	0.544	0.458	0.622
SC V2	0.642	0.634	0.619	0.680	0.641	0.625
EMAIL U	0.125	0.094	0.096	0.073	0.120	0.102
VCONF U	0.070	0.047	0.175	0.088	0.011	0.141
KR U	0.393	0.413	0.320	0.300	0.393	0.382
IKD U	0.547	0.508	0.296	0.262	0.436	0.349
EL U	0.427	0.402	0.609	0.397	0.384	0.532
ODF U	0.469	0.266	0.274	0.171	0.388	0.184
VCOM U	0.274	0.179	0.206	0.259	0.200	0.137
VT U	0.324	0.267	0.376	0.401	0.288	0.258

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	INFO U1	INFO U2	INFO U3	INFO U4	CC U1	CC U2
INFO U1	0.991					
INFO U2	0.344	0.809				
INFO U3	0.417	0.414	1.232			
INFO U4	0.420	0.348	0.464	0.755		
CC U1	0.346	0.568	0.438	0.311	0.877	
CC U2	0.382	0.521	0.575	0.429	0.539	1.059
CC U3	0.360	0.463	0.495	0.439	0.612	0.616
CC U4	0.285	0.420	0.355	0.377	0.522	0.532
SC N1	0.214	0.322	0.394	0.340	0.397	0.412
SC N2	0.230	0.346	0.500	0.399	0.358	0.449
SC T1	0.230	0.329	0.501	0.428	0.284	0.518
SC T2	0.154	0.340	0.353	0.310	0.335	0.513
SC T3	0.160	0.325	0.333	0.327	0.347	0.545
SC T4	0.228	0.305	0.281	0.302	0.383	0.453
SC T5	0.157	0.269	0.339	0.296	0.304	0.383
SC T6	0.118	0.201	0.343	0.288	0.247	0.346
SC V1	0.221	0.242	0.419	0.356	0.252	0.459
SC V2	0.303	0.368	0.463	0.450	0.412	0.567
EMAIL U	0.180	0.184	0.164	0.132	0.158	0.167
VCONF U	0.160	0.024	0.137	0.080	0.054	0.118
KR U	0.474	0.262	0.315	0.333	0.273	0.336
IKD U	0.382	0.352	0.390	0.350	0.280	0.406
EL U	0.291	0.156	0.542	0.331	0.175	0.308
ODF U	0.396	0.210	0.392	0.355	0.081	0.424

VCOM_U	0.201	0.133	0.311	0.239	0.067	0.282
VT_U	0.331	0.249	0.411	0.299	0.290	0.492

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	CC_U3	CC_U4	SC_N1	SC_N2	SC_T1	SC_T2
CC_U3	0.908					
CC_U4	0.570	0.929				
SC_N1	0.458	0.455	1.432			
SC_N2	0.454	0.395	1.096	1.342		
SC_T1	0.479	0.436	0.864	0.953	1.750	
SC_T2	0.536	0.482	0.829	0.810	1.102	1.468
SC_T3	0.528	0.522	0.756	0.722	1.052	1.155
SC_T4	0.443	0.560	0.631	0.575	0.632	0.572
SC_T5	0.410	0.397	0.767	0.734	0.864	0.822
SC_T6	0.456	0.367	0.709	0.673	0.833	0.829
SC_V1	0.436	0.387	0.667	0.699	0.972	0.967
SC_V2	0.574	0.450	0.786	0.780	0.867	0.874
EMAIL_U	0.166	0.223	0.166	0.140	0.148	0.147
VCONF_U	0.152	0.121	0.194	0.197	0.201	0.206
KR_U	0.301	0.183	0.302	0.326	0.270	0.228
IKD_U	0.346	0.252	0.396	0.431	0.497	0.445
EL_U	0.328	0.274	0.353	0.457	0.577	0.514
ODF_U	0.213	0.221	0.265	0.264	0.371	0.292
VCOM_U	0.169	0.132	0.174	0.216	0.353	0.324
VT_U	0.431	0.330	0.379	0.364	0.550	0.493

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	SC_T3	SC_T4	SC_T5	SC_T6	SC_V1	SC_V2
SC_T3	1.428					
SC_T4	0.640	0.982				
SC_T5	0.880	0.545	1.450			
SC_T6	0.887	0.473	1.003	1.715		
SC_V1	1.024	0.517	0.957	1.076	1.762	
SC_V2	0.969	0.653	0.863	0.899	1.277	1.795
EMAIL_U	0.129	0.163	0.111	0.097	0.086	0.068
VCONF_U	0.143	0.030	0.050	0.154	0.239	0.139
KR_U	0.226	0.181	0.261	0.227	0.324	0.337
IKD_U	0.476	0.298	0.326	0.339	0.411	0.471
EL_U	0.537	0.197	0.458	0.599	0.695	0.487
ODF_U	0.292	0.137	0.191	0.260	0.237	0.275
VCOM_U	0.395	0.060	0.254	0.458	0.387	0.231
VT_U	0.541	0.231	0.399	0.536	0.540	0.444

Covariance Matrix (continued)

	EMAIL_U	VCONF_U	KR_U	IKD_U	EL_U	ODF_U	VCOM_U	VT_U
EMAIL_U	0.278							
VCONF_U	0.084	1.459						
KR_U	0.143	0.165	1.045					
IKD_U	0.131	0.134	0.590	1.342				
EL_U	0.105	0.471	0.395	0.601	2.144			
ODF_U	0.143	0.256	0.351	0.373	0.446	2.206		
VCOM_U	0.124	0.411	0.331	0.449	0.769	0.981	2.322	
VT_U	0.185	0.533	0.402	0.419	0.948	0.671	1.568	2.616