

2006

Emergent Conversational Technologies that are Democratising Information Systems in Organisations: the case of the corporate Wiki

Helen M. Hasan

University of Wollongong, hasan@uow.edu.au

C. Pfaff

Central Queensland University

Publication Details

This paper was originally published as: Hasan, H & Pfaff, CC, Emergent Conversational Technologies that are Democratising Information Systems in Organisations: the case of the corporate Wiki, Proceedings of the Information Systems Foundations (ISF): Theory, Representation and Reality Conference, Australian National University, Canberra, 27-28 September 2006.

Emergent Conversational Technologies that are Democratising Information Systems in Organisations: the case of the corporate Wiki

Abstract

Conversational technologies such as discussion forums, chatrooms, Weblogs or blogs and Wikis have transformed the way information is exchanged and disseminated in civil society but their take up in corporations is slow. One reason for this is the way they democratise organisational information and knowledge with consequential changes in the distribution of power, rights and obligations. The authors will discuss the opportunities and the threats associated with the corporate Wiki and the implications of this for the future of the field of Information Systems.

Keywords

Conversational Technologies, Corporate Wikis, knowledge work

Disciplines

Business | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Publication Details

This paper was originally published as: Hasan, H & Pfaff, CC, Emergent Conversational Technologies that are Democratising Information Systems in Organisations: the case of the corporate Wiki, Proceedings of the Information Systems Foundations (ISF): Theory, Representation and Reality Conference, Australian National University, Canberra, 27-28 September 2006.

Emergent Conversational Technologies that are Democratising Information Systems in Organisations: the case of the corporate Wiki

Helen Hasan

Information Systems, University of Wollongong

Charmaine C Pfaff

Central Queensland University, (CMS), Sydney International Campus

Abstract

Conversational technologies such as discussion forums, chatrooms, Weblogs or blogs and Wikis have transformed the way information is exchanged and disseminated in civil society but their take up in corporations is slow. One reason for this is the way they democratise organisational information and knowledge with consequential changes in the distribution of power, rights and obligations. The authors will discuss the opportunities and the threats associated with the corporate Wiki and the implications of this for the future of the field of Information Systems.

1. Introduction

Together with Personal Digital Assistants (PDA)s and mobile telephones, conversational technologies such as email, discussion forums, chatrooms, Weblogs and Wikis have been readily adopted in civil society and are transforming the way many of us access information. We now conduct transactions and interconnect with others anywhere and any time in our everyday lives. However these transforming systems are treated with suspicion by the organisations in which we work, often with out-moded ICT tools and limitations imposed by management on our social uses of email, telephone and the Internet in general. It is proposed in this paper that the future of the Information Systems (IS) discipline should include attention to the adoption and impact of open cooperative technologies in the workplace. Since the 1970s IS has endeavoured to take a distinctive scientific approach to representing the data and processes of big formal organisations in the design of computer based systems. The authors believe that IS cannot afford to get mired in issues to do with 20th century technology and must move on to a world where the technology increasingly empowers the individual, with consequences of democratising organisational information and knowledge.

Conversational technologies can be seen as tools to support work units and the individual knowledge worker. For this new breed of employee, it is as much part of their job to seek out, share and create knowledge as it is to perform work tasks. They need the skills, capabilities and authority, as well as Information and Communications Technology (ICT) support, to do this thereby providing the firm with innovation and creativity. While this is an obvious opportunity for organisations to increase their competitive advantage, it also poses a challenge where employers and managers may have to relinquish some control in providing knowledge workers with appropriate resources, incentives and rewards. This is also a challenge for research and practice in the field of IS which can no longer employ traditional analysis and design approaches to the new socio-technical organisational systems where knowledge workers may chose to use applications such as Weblogs and Wikis and develop them as end-users. This may be perceived as a threat to shift the core focus of IS research and practice but may be an opportunity for IS to re-invent itself to be relevant for the 21st century.

In order to make this argument, the paper will examine the issues, challenges and potential benefits arising from the prospect of implementing Wiki technologies in corporate or government settings. Four cases will be presented where the use of a Wiki is being adopted or at least considered to enable broad participation in knowledge management in a formal work setting. The cases are chosen to showcase a variety of corporate Wikis in different developmental stages. The first case study records a failed attempt at setting up a Wiki in a conservative organisation whose business is acquiring and transferring knowledge. The second case study examined the prospect of setting up a Wiki for professionals in a state-wide government health department. The third case study explored the use of a Wiki by a national Standards organisation for knowledge collection and dissemination among small businesses. Lastly, an evaluation was made of an existing Wiki in the research division of a large private manufacturing organisation. The potential benefits and challenges of each will be described leading to a general discussion on the democratising affect of Wiki technology in the hands of individuals and the need for organisations to strike a balance between control and trust. The challenges and opportunities of this technology for IS practitioners and researchers are discussed in the following paragraphs.

2. Conversational Technologies

2.1. Some Background

Wagner and Bolloju (2005) portrayed the three technologies, discussion forums, wikis, and weblogs or blogs, as conversational technologies. Conversational technologies facilitate processes where knowledge creation and storage is carried out through a discussion forum where participants contribute to the discussion with questions and answers, or through a blog which is typified by a process of storytelling or through a Wiki using collaborative writing. Constructivist learning theorists (Vygotsky, 1978; Leidner & Jarvenpaa, 1995) explained that the process of expressing knowledge aids its creation and conversations benefit the refinement of knowledge. Cheung et al (2005) maintains that conversational knowledge management fulfils this purpose because conversations, e.g. questions and answers, become the source of relevant knowledge.

It is our contention that new and exciting issues of information processing and knowledge management are presented as these conversational technologies infiltrate organisations. They are becoming almost ubiquitous in some circles but raising controversies in others. However studies of these phenomena are only now beginning to appear in the literature. An informative study of online discussion groups was undertaken by Timbrell et al (2005) drawing out the particular language and associated behaviour that has emerged in this arena such as patterns of posting, the active core (about 30% of members), seeding of threads, self-imposed netiquette, moderation, lurking, etc. Such studies are made possible because

these technologies leave a permanent and structured electronic record of the social phenomena being studied.

According to Semple (2006), blogs and Wikis have dominated the scene because of their appeal to the wider community and their ability to disseminate knowledge. However, blogs are time indexed, set up by an individual and tend to focus on the current topic. Comments and entries are usually made by one participant at a time. Holding a senior position as Head of Knowledge Management in the BBC, Semple (ibid) introduced blogs and Wikis into the previously conservative organisation to make the most of this wired-up world of work and learnt how businesses can prepare themselves for the challenges and the opportunities they represent. While he describes the obvious popularity of the General Manager's daily blog, it is the adoption of Wikis for corporate knowledge management that is particularly compelling.

2.2. Issues of Ownership and Democratisation

Research by Hart and Warne (2005) has shown that it is difficult to get different parties to share organisational data, information and knowledge because it is difficult to integrate the cultural foundations of organisations with organisational politics and power. These authors propose that those who are reluctant or refuse to share data, information or knowledge with each other, can generally be identified with different sub-cultures within the organisation. Different value sets, beliefs, assumptions, norms of behaviour and so on, could be a source of power struggles, conflict and political activity concerning not only data, information and knowledge sharing but also in other areas of organizational activity. The culturally oriented view suggests that a lack of sharing of organisational data, information and knowledge is a behaviour that can be changed. People who are refusing to share can be encouraged or educated to see the benefits of sharing or the organizational culture changed. In contrast, the politically oriented view argues that sharing takes place only with those who want to share. Encouraging, educating or coercing sharing will not be successful, and even detrimental.

Traditionally, the channels of information have been controlled by those who have wealth or influence. The creation of the Internet has had a democratising effect on the availability and use of information. Many users who are active on the Internet are there because they are attracted to the equal access it allows and its break from traditional media. Affordable E-Commerce has provided an opportunity for individuals and small businesses to compete in the global market place often more successfully than cumbersome multi-national companies. Democracy raises public awareness of issues such as openness, freedom of information and public accountability (Benkler 2006).

The same democratising effect will be true of conversational technologies. A Wiki represents the power of many and this power is distributed collectively to improve content quality. Each author is able to change the contributions of other authors, refining the quality of the knowledge assets.

A Wiki can be a type of 'information commons' that are common spaces where people can share experiences and have unanticipated, un-chosen exposures to the ideas of other people. Sunstein (2006) argues that the on-line effort of joining together people with diverse talents and interests to achieve common goals might well provide the best path to infotopia. However in order for that to happen, people must feel they have more to gain from coming together than from being independent. Scardamalia (2003) adds that symmetric knowledge advancement occurs when the participants in a network are able to advance their own knowledge-building agendas by helping other participants advance theirs.

2.3. The Wiki Phenomenon

A Wiki is a web-based application that allows many participants to write collaboratively, where they can continue to add to or edit the content of documents and dynamically determine the relationships between sets of documents. Such documents can be anything

supported by the web with hyperlinks to anywhere on the World Wide Web including text, image and video. It is named after the Hawaiian term 'Wiki' meaning 'quick', 'fast', or 'to hasten' which is symbolic of the quick changes in the editing processes (Leuf & Cunningham 2005). A Wiki is therefore a collection of interlinked HTML web pages and has crosslinks between internal pages where each page can be edited but a complete record of such changes can be kept. In addition, any change can be easily reverted to any of its previous states. A Wiki can be accessed from any web browser and no other special tools are needed to create and edit existing pages.

A Wiki can be said to be an evolving knowledge repository where users are encouraged to make additions to this repository by adding new documents or working on existing ones (Pfaff & Hasan 2006). The Wiki takes advantage of the collaborative efforts of all members of the organisation to create an effective library of knowledge. An organisation that wants to survive and grow in the global competitive marketplace needs to familiarise itself with 'organisational learning' (Argyris and Schoen. 1996; Friedman et al 2005). How successful an organisation is at being able to acquire and deploy this knowledge, will determine its competitive advantage.

Wiki sites have been created using several development tools and languages. The original Wiki developed by Ward Cunningham in 1994 was written in HyperPerl. Many clones have been written in other languages e.g. Python, Java, Smalltalk, Active Server Pages, Ruby, PHP and Visual Basic. Blake (2001) states that the open platform makes it versatile to create clones to support corporate or departmental intranets. Many public sites, such as Wikispaces¹, offer an area on their Wiki that either free to the public or for a small annual fee if it is for private use.

The most well known example of a Wiki is the popular English language version of Wikipedia², which was started in 2001 and now has nearly 900,000 articles. Wikipedias have been published in 200 languages with a total of more than three million articles. Contributions come from all over the world. It is estimated that 100,000 people have made contributions, which includes four million editing work done on the articles. More people have visited Wikipedia than popular sites such as the online the New York Times and CNN.

As their uses have become more apparent, countless numbers of Wikis have been created since then, mostly independent of formal organisations. For corporations to consider adopting the Wiki as a growing and living resource for knowledge management, a Wiki provides an ideal collaboration environment offering users the capability to co-create and co-evolve a knowledge repository. Central to the concept of a Wiki is that a Wiki user does not need to have any technical (computing or web-related) expertise to add, edit or delete a page. This means that even a novice user can contribute to the knowledge acquisition process in an organisation. A Wiki allows sufficient flexibility for users to lend their own interpretation about a particular topic. It avoids individual bias because the content of the data is determined by all the users.

There are however social and legal issues that are mitigating against the easy uptake of Wikis in corporations. If the Wiki can be described as a 'social software' (Swisher 2004), then there are social factors that must undergo some changes before the Wiki will be accepted to improve the organisation's knowledge management. The informal network approach that is currently favoured in a Wiki, may make some companies believe that their data quality will be affected and that system errors will occur. However, a centralised and highly structured environment will make it difficult to adopt a 'community approach' towards knowledge acquisition. Knowledge management priorities are linked to organisational structure and as Santoro and Gopalakrishnan (2000) argue, knowledge management priorities are affected by environmental structures.

A Wiki is open to vandalism as demonstrated in one well-known case. The Los Angeles Times experimented with a Wiki editorial and invited readers to collaborate online to add

¹ www.wikispaces.com

² <http://en.Wikipedia.org>

facts or update information. This 'Wikitorial' only lasted three days because a few readers had posted obscene photographs on the site. The newspaper had to put the website out of commission because they could not prevent future disruptions (Shepard 2005).

There is no recognition of authorship in a Wiki because pages can be freely written or edited by anybody. This goes against the innate need by workers for recognition, as well as a belief that the source of contributions should be accurately reflected. The Wiki software uses the 'contributors tag' for general name recognition of 'good' authors or editors. However, this might lead to disputes among the contributors that they have not contributed 'enough' to the article to be considered as one of the authors or editors.

There are also concerns on the quality of content that contributors make. As stated in 'Wikipedia' (2006), it is the official policy of Wikipedia to adopt a 'neutral point of view' or NPOV, to prevent the biased views of some authors. This is to appeal to the largesse of the majority to be fair and conciliatory if there are conflicts in opinions. To maintain quality compliance standards, an organisation needs assurance that the information on a Wiki is credible. There is a need to determine matters of responsibility and decide who is held accountable if the data is fraudulent. The principal dilemma of a Wiki is that, while its anarchic nature is desirable for fostering open debate without censorship, it also raises questions about the quality of information available, which could inhibit its usefulness. Issues of quality control need to be thought through. However an evaluation of knowledge quality is extremely difficult to measure. Donabedian (1980) suggests that measures of process and structure can be used as indirect indicators of quality. For example, one must take into account the reliability of information, provision of context, qualification of authors, as well as the use or acceptance of this information by other employees.

There are legal concerns in the use of a Wiki in a formal organisational setting. The ability to protect intellectual property is being undermined by the use of a Wiki where it is difficult to determine the true source of authorship because there are many authors contributing to an item. Another example of legal concerns is demonstrated in the case of John Seigenthaler, a former assistant attorney general working under Bobby Kennedy, who was dismayed that a false Wikipedia entry listed him as having been briefly suspected of involvement in the assassinations of both John Kennedy and Robert Kennedy (Seigenthaler 2005). However, legal experts assert that Section 230 of the Federal Communications Act (CDA) 1996 made Wikipedia safe from legal liability for libel, regardless of how long an inaccurate article stays on the site. As Wikipedia is a service provider and not a publisher, that makes them immune from liability for libel (Terdiman 2005).

3. Cases of Actual or Potential Wiki Adoption

Four cases are now described where the use of a Wiki is being adopted or at least considered to enable broad participation in knowledge management in a formal work setting. The cases are chosen as a variety of corporate Wikis in different developmental stages and presented in order from least likely to most likely to be sustainable. The potential benefits and challenges of each will be contemplated.

3.1. Case One: a failed attempt at setting up a Wiki in a knowledge institution

This research project was planned as a piece of action research where the researchers would participate in the setting up a Wiki in the organisation and observe its contribution to knowledge management. When it became apparent that management support would not be forthcoming, the research plan was altered to identify and examine the reasons for the organisation's reluctance to proceed with the Wiki project.

The organisation was a small educational institution with less than 200 employees. The organisation has developed a centralised knowledge portal where employees drew heavily

from this portal, accessing previous reports and research papers; work plans, project schedules and best practices that are critical to customer support. The employees of the organisation were concerned about the risk of informational overload and deterioration of the quality of information, as drawbacks of the system. It was time-consuming to read everything that purports to be information. The search engine yielded far too many hits or the keywords gave unanticipated meanings. Sometimes, a user may not get any hits at all, without the precise keywords.

The institution had few resources to address the challenges posed by the knowledge portal, and could not afford an expensive knowledge management system. They initially welcomed the chance to set up a Wiki as part of our study of the adoption of corporate Wikis for knowledge management projects. The Wiki was seen by some as a tool to cause a major transformation in the way the institution would manage knowledge resources, while keeping in mind, its constraints. However it was not long before management decided to cancel the project and reject the Wiki concept outright.

Much of what is discussed above on the merits of promoting an open democratic approach to knowledge sharing has been ignored by the organisation that favours a traditional organisational structure. Management were concerned that the use of a Wiki may flatten the organisational hierarchy, changing traditional and hierarchical communication channels (Stenmark 2003). If knowledge is power, then senior executives were reluctant to share this power with their subordinates. The organisation did not offer cultural support such as reward and recognition programs for the sharing of knowledge within the organisation.

It was noted that the organisation favoured a top down management approach which can be seen as undermining the process of the democratisation of knowledge. There are a number of reasons for centralised control. The organisation maintains that it offers better quality control in its existing approach to documentation management with formal editing opportunities, review and verification stages. Their implementation of specific objectives in this regard makes it a simple task to ensure local compliance and checking if these objectives have been met.

The potential for 'Wiki vandalism' was another reason cited by the case organisation for its reluctance to implement a Wiki. Vandalism involves editing a Wiki in a wilful and destructive manner to deface the website or change the content to include irrelevant content. Since the Wiki would have no organisational or social boundaries, the case for vandalism might be overwhelming. The insertion of spam links, and false and malicious content about groups and individuals were considered possible violations as well. They were concerned with how can the organisation could be assured that the information on a Wiki was credible and correct. Management overlooked the fact that 'Wiki vandalism' often occurred on public Wikis. They would not address matters of responsibility and accountability as expected from each employee.

3.2. Case Two: the prospect of setting up a Wiki for professionals in a state-wide government health department

This case was motivated by an ongoing project, in a central Coordination and Monitoring Unit for ICUs of a State Health System in Australia, to develop a web-based service to meet the information needs of administrators and clinicians in ICUs of their public hospitals. Material posted on the website was carefully developed and controlled by specially appointed expert committees. At the same time the Unit started up an online discussion forum that grew in popularity with ICU professionals. Membership included clinicians from the state hospital and ICU professionals from hospitals in other states and countries. Discussions on this list included valuable information and advice on topics of immediate concern but these were archived in a generic form and were difficult to access at a future date.

From time to time, the Unit considered the possibility of extracting text on given topics from the discussion lists and using it to produce formal material to be posted on the website.

However using the current procedure, this would involve constituting a relevant expert committee to edit and evaluate the material into a formal document that would pass the quality control demanded for posting on the website. Resources were not available to do this. An alternative suggestion was to install a Wiki and allow members of the discussion groups to transfer suitable sets of postings into the Wiki where members could edit it themselves into a document to go up on the public website. Although this solution was approved in principle and technically could be set up quite quickly, progress in the near future is unlikely for reasons not dissimilar to that of Case One. Government health departments are notoriously conservative and risk averse and do not have the flexibility or agility to approve implementation of such an unknown technology without long deliberation.

3.3. Case Three: the use of a Wiki by a national Standards organisation for knowledge collection and dissemination among small businesses

The Business and Management Division of Standards Australia has recently produced descriptive standards in areas such as governance, knowledge management, risk management and so on. These have been readily adopted in large private and public organisations but not by small businesses where they are seen as costly, inappropriate and irrelevant. A committee for Small Business was established to produce material to address this problem but did not have a clear direction or the necessary resources to do this, because of the traditional approaches that were adopted. This project was suggested as a solution which could be implemented at low cost by a research student. A Wiki could be set up and seeded with summary material from the various Business Standards. Suitable members of the small business community would be invited to add experiences, advice etc to this material to build up a body of knowledge on these topic with an appropriated focus on small business issues. The material could be monitored and edited by members of the committee and the result could then be made available at no cost to small business managers. This is a project currently underway and has the makings of an ideal research endeavour and demonstrates the use of a corporate Wiki.

3.4. Case Four: an existing Wiki in the research division of a large private manufacturing organisation

This project investigates employee perceptions of the role and value of an existing Wiki set up for knowledge management of the Research Division of a large multinational corporation. As typical knowledge workers, employees in this division were deemed to require new awareness and skills in knowledge management but their supervisors were not sure how to give employees the resources and authority for this. The Wiki was established by the Research Division's Knowledge Management Officer to allow employees to access the Division's documents, plans, reports etc and enables them to create and share new knowledge on current and past work activities. However the Wiki is not being used by the employees as intended.

A team of researchers were invited to study the employees' use of, and attitudes towards, the Wiki within the organisational reality of how they do their work, solve problems, and acquire new knowledge. The project brings together the expertise of investigators in information systems knowledge management and organisational learning and aims to develop a model in the context of the industry partner's whole knowledge management strategy. At this stage research funding is being sought for this project and the authors intend to report more on the progress of this project at a later stage.

4. Discussion

4.1. Lessons from the Four Cases

None of the four cases described above present a complete success story of a corporate Wiki although the level of achievement improves from Case One to Case Four. In Cases One, Two and Three we are dealing with traditional, conservative public sector organisations for all of which conversational technologies are relatively new and not well understood. The educational institution of Case One expresses most concern for the open nature of a Wiki and rejected its use outright. The Health Department Unit of Case Two was receptive to the use of a Wiki, perhaps because of positive results from its online discussion forum but was still cautious about giving full consent to the Wiki project without further deliberation. They could see benefits from the joint and voluntary collaboration that would enable them to capture and generate up-to-date professional knowledge but were wary of how they would ensure quality control of the output if they were to put it on their public website. Standards Australia as discussed in Case Three was concerned about developing a Knowledge Management System that would manage the exhaustive generation of the content and editing work that went with the presentation of its publications. Managers of the Standards Australia were quite enthusiastic about the use of a Wiki, both to collect content and to make it publicly available. However they did not have the final responsibility of the knowledge that would end up in the small business because the Wiki would be hosted outside the organisation and ultimately be part of a research endeavour. They were however prepared to have their organisation's name associated with the Wiki.

It is from Case Four that most can be learnt about the benefits and challenges of the corporate Wiki as it is already in operation. First, they have overcome resistance of management to having this type of technological system. Second, the Wiki was given senior level management support. In contrast to the concerns of the other cases, their main problem was to get employees to use it so that issues of the balance between control and trust have not yet been faced. Research has been commissioned by the Wiki sponsor to analyse employees' ability and willingness to use and contribute to the Wiki. There is some indication that the Wiki may challenge management authority by attempting to engage the knowledge worker in a more participatory knowledge management capability and environment. An action research approach will be used to determine the ability of the corporate Wiki to drive and enable the democratisation of information and knowledge where there is a change of culture which says that knowledge management is the responsibility of all workers.

Drucker observes that "... fewer and fewer people are subordinates - even in fairly low-level jobs. Increasingly they are knowledge workers. Knowledge workers cannot be managed as subordinates; they are associates... This difference is more than cosmetic. Once beyond the apprentice stage, knowledge workers must know more about their job than their boss does - or what good are they? The very definition of a knowledge worker is one who knows more about his or her job than anyone else in the organisation" (Drucker 1998). However he goes on to say that, "The productivity of the knowledge worker is still abysmally low. It has probably not improved in the past 100 or even 200 years-for the simple reason that nobody has worked at improving the productivity. All our work on productivity has been on the productivity of the manual worker. The way one maximizes their performance is by capitalizing on their strengths and their knowledge rather than trying to force them into moulds." It could be that new ICT tools such as the Wiki that can both drive and enable changes to this effect within organisations.

4.2. The challenges and opportunities for IS

The characteristic of IS that distinguishes it from other management fields in the social sciences is that it concerns the use of “artefacts in human-machine systems” (Gregor 2002). Conversely the characteristic that distinguishes IS from more technical fields, such as Computer Science and Information Technology, is its concern for the human elements in organisational and social systems. The field of IS emerged in the 1970s when there was a need to have more rigorous and scientific methodologies for building organisational computer-based systems that accurately represented the data and processes of the real world. Since that time IS research has drawn its significance from the uniqueness of computer-based information and communication tools and their place in shaping recent human, social and organisational history.

The information systems of the 20th century are now firmly entrenched as basic infrastructure in most organisations. However in the 21st Century, computer-based tools continue to change so that advances in the IS field will only result from a better understanding of the latest types of applications; who is using them, how they are being used and for what purposes. Conversational technologies such as Wikis can readily be set up and used effectively with no assistance or guidance from organisational IT service units. This poses a whole new set of issues of ownership and authority that challenges existing organisational cultures and power structures. The authors believe that this is an exciting time for IS to take on a whole new relevance for organisations and must be relevant for a world where the technology increasingly empowers the individual, and consequently democratises organisational information and knowledge.

5. References

- Argyris, C., & Schoen, D., “Organisational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective”, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Argyris, C. and Schoen, D., “Organisational Learning II: Theory, Method, and Practice”, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1996.
- Benkler Y (2006) *The Wealth of Networks* http://www.benkler.org/wealth_of_networks/
- Blake, J. “WikiWikiweb”, Computerworld, January 29, 2001, viewed 5 May 2006, <http://www.computerworld.com/printthis/2001/0,4814,56996,00.html>
- Bogdanowicz, M.S. & Bailey, E.K., “The value of knowledge and the values of the new knowledge worker: generation x in the new economy”, Journal of European Industrial Training, Vol. 26, No. 2-4, 2002, 125.
- Bova, B. and Kroth, M., “Closing the gap: the mentoring of Generation X”, Journal of Adult Education, Vol. 27 No.1, Summer, 1999, 7-17.
- Cheung, K. S. K., Lee, F. S. L., Ip, R. K. F., & Wagner, C. “The development of successful on-line communities”, International Journal of the Computer, the Internet and Management, vol.13, no.1, 2005, 71-89.
- Donabedian, A., “Explorations in quality assessment and monitoring”, The definition of quality and approaches to its assessment, Vol 1. 1980. Ann Arbor, MI: Health Administration Press.
- Drucker, P. (1998) Management’s new paradigms. Forbes, 1998, 5 October.
- Friedman, H.H., Friedman, L.W., Pollack, S. “Transforming a University from a Teaching Organisation to a Learning Organisation”, Review of Business, vol.26, no.3, 2005, 31-36.

-
- Fuchs-Kittowski F. and Koehler Andre (2005) Wiki Communities in the Context of Work Processes, *Proceedings of WikiSym 05* 33-39
- Gregor S. (2002) A theory of Theories in Information Systems, in S. Gregor and D. Hart, *Information Systems Foundations: Building the Theoretical Basis*, ANU Canberra, 1-20
- Hart, D. (2002). Ownership as an Issue in Data and Information Sharing: A Philosophically Based View, *Australian Journal of Information Systems* (Special Issue): pp.23-29.
- Hart D. and Warne L. (2005) Comparing Cultural and Political Perspectives of Data, Information and Knowledge Sharing in Organizations, *Journal of KM*
- Ives, W., Athey, R. & Jooste, A. *New tools to link the changing workforce*, KM Review, viewed 1 May 2006, <http://www.melcru.com/offer/bill/newtools.pdf>
- Marshall, J. 2004, "Managing different generations at work", *Financial Executive*, Vol. 20, No. 5, 2004, 18.
- Kruse, K. "Buckle Up: Generation Y is here", Chief Learning Officer, March 2004, viewed 1 May 2006, http://www.clomedia.com/content/templates/clo_col_elearning.asp?articleid=410&zoneid=46
- Lee, S, Hwang T. & Lee, H., "Corporate blogging strategies of Fortune 500 Companies, *Management Decision*", Vol.4, No. 3, 2006, 316-334.
- Leidner, D. & Jarvenpaa, S. "The use of information technology to enhance management school education: A theoretical view", *MIS Quarterly*, vol.19, no.3, 1995, 265-291.
- Leuf, B & Cunningham, W., *The Wiki Way, Quick Collaboration of the Web*, Addison-Wesley, 2001.
- Pfaff, C.C. & Hasan, H., "Overcoming Organisational Resistance to using Wiki Technology for Knowledge Management", paper presented at 10th Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems, 6 – 9 July 2006.
- Rubenstein, H., "Review: a company of citizens", *Growth Strategies Inc.*, 2003, viewed 3 May, 2006, <http://growth-strategies.com/subpages/articles/021.html>,
- Santoro, M.D., & Gopalakrishnan, S., "The Institutionalization of knowledge transfer activities within industry–university collaborative ventures", *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, vol.17, no.3–4, 2000, 299–319.
- Scardamalia, M. (2003). Knowledge Society Network (KSN): Toward an expert society for democratizing knowledge. *Journal of Distance Education*, 17 (Suppl. 3, Learning Technology Innovation in Canada), 63-66.
- Seigenthaler, J, 2005. "A false Wikipedia 'biography'", *USA Today*, 29 November.
- Semple E. (2006) Presentation to the NSW KM Society.
- Shepard, A. C., "Postings of Obscene Photos End Free-Form Editorial Experiment", *New York Times*, 21 June, 2005.
- Stenmark, D., "Knowledge Creation and the Web: Factors Indicating Why Some Intranets Succeed Where Others Fail", *Knowledge and Process Management*, vol.10, no.3, 2003, 207–216.
- Suntein, C.R. 2006. *Infotopia: How Many Minds Produce Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, USA
- "Survey: The Wiki Principle", *The Economist*, London: 22 April, Vol.379, Iss. 8474, 2006. p. 10
- Swisher, K. "Boomtown: "Wiki" may alter how employees work together", *Wall Street Journal*, Jul 29, p. B1.

Terdiman, D., "Is Wikipedia safe from libel liability?" CNET News.com

December 7, 2005, viewed 21 February 2006.

http://news.com.com/Is+Wikipedia+safe+from+libel+liability/2100-1025_3-5984880.html?tag=st.rc.targ_mb

Timbrell G. Taule O. Lambe P. (2005) Throwing pebbles into a dark Cave: a study of participation and behaviours in the only act-km online community, a presentation at the *ActKM Conference*, Canberra, October 2005.

Tulgan, B. and Martin, C.A., *Managing Generation Y: Global Citizens Born in the Late Seventies and Early Eighties*, HRD Press, Amherst, MA. 2001.

Von Hippel E. (2005) *Democratising Innovation*, MIT Press Massachusetts.

Vygotsky, L. *Mind in Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Wagner, C. & Bolloju, N. "Supporting Knowledge Management in Organisations with Conversational Technologies: Discussion Forums, Weblogs, and Wikis, Editorial Preface", *Journal of Database Management*, vol.16, no.2, ABI/INFORM Global, 2005, p.1.

'Wikipedia', the free encyclopedia, "Wikipedia: Neutral point of view", viewed 22 February 2006. <http://en.Wikipedia.org/Wiki/NPOV>

'Wikipedia', the free encyclopedia, "Wikipedia: Copyrights", viewed 22 February 2006, <http://en.Wikipedia.org/Wiki/Wikipedia:Copyrights>