

Why Link Knowledge Management, Organizational Culture and Ethics: Inquiring Results

Gonçalo Costa¹, Mary Prior², Simon Rogerson¹

¹Centre for Computing and Social Responsibility, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK

²Department of Informatics, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK

goncaloj@netc.pt

mprior@dmu.ac.uk

srog@dmu.ac.uk

Keywords: Knowledge management, organizational culture, ethics, ethical issues, social dilemmas, empirical outcomes

Abstract

This paper aims to understand how the interaction between knowledge management, organizational culture and ethics occur, focusing on the potential tensions between personal and collective knowledge in learning organizations. These tensions are reflected upon ethical and social dilemmas which are often neglected by managers and produce unexpected impacts into the organizational strategy. Therefore, this contribution is divided into two main sections: knowledge management (levels, dimensions, and ethical issues/social dilemmas); empirical procedures (methodological design, data collection methods, and empirical outcomes). However, in order to promote a reliable argument, this manuscript will shed some light about the underlying topics.

Knowledge management (KM) can be characterized as the acquisition and utilization of resources to generate a milieu in which information is available to all, allowing individuals to obtain, share and employ that information to increase their own knowledge and apply their knowledge for organizational benefit. Despite this consideration, KM as a strategy encompasses two antagonistic levels of analysis: personal knowledge management (PKM) and organizational knowledge management (OKM), leading to potential tensions. Moreover, the “knowledge continuum process” is synchronized throughout organizational culture, technology, and ethics. As a result, it is fundamental to approach the ethical issues (free access to organizational knowledge, autonomy, dignity, privacy, intellectual property, fair compensation), and social dilemmas (organizational trust) that literature claims.

Moving forward, this research project unites descriptive and explanatory assumptions through an interpretative and critical epistemological study. Additionally, an embedded multiple-case study with grounded theory (multi-method) will be under scrutiny. Nevertheless, the complex and sensitive nature of the research imposes challenges regarding data collection methods (interviews and questionnaires), leading to protocol fine-tune in order to improve the level of confidence. In spite of these constraints, the empirical outcomes clearly demonstrate that a wide range of ethical issues and social dilemmas occur within organizational contexts, which managers do not recognize or neglect.

1. Introduction

Manuel Castells suggests that economic and informational global networks are a critical novel circumstance of “network society”, which resumes technical progress that characterizes modern society. As a consequence, KM investigation has accomplished an unbelievable pace since its foundation as widespread literature demonstrates (Ponzi and Koenig 2002). A vast portion of this literature acknowledges how knowledge is transformed and flows over the organization, or whether it relies on persons or organizations (Von Krogh, Ichijo, and Nonaka 2000); or, it debates the technologies that support it (Poston and Speier 2005). Nonetheless, knowledge society *status quo* imposes an obligatory debate as regards to ethical issues and social dilemmas that arise namely in organizational contexts.

As a final remark, this contribution aims to emphasize and review the empirical results concerning pilot studies data collection (a usual component of ongoing PhD research projects), in order to reply a feasible answer concerning the research question: why link KM, organizational culture and ethics?

2. Knowledge Management

2.1 Levels

2.1.1 Personal

PKM is not a novel conceptualization; even so intends to indicate how people manage its individual knowledge. The major disparity as regards to organizational KM, it is the underlying possibility to describe individual incentives and actions within organizational environments in a more successful way (Sinclair 2008). Numerous researchers and practitioners have recognized this concept, despite Polanyi's (1958) prior utilization.

Following Higgison (2005), PKM involves managing and supporting individual knowledge and accessible information, in order to obtain considerable value for that individual; social networks perpetuation; making life easier; and exploiting personal capital. Consequently, this concept can be linked to the issue of personal information management (PIM), particularly personal space of information (Jones and Bruce 2005). This perception entails all informational objects that are, at least presumably, under that individual control (although not inevitably exclusive) (Efimova 2005).

2.1.2 Organizational

OKM concerns how an organization adjusts to shifting settings in order to endure, utilizes and increases knowledge assets, as well as knowledge transfer within and between institutions. As a result, it aims to bind four essential analytical dimensions: knowledge acquisition, information distribution, information interpretation and organisational memory (Cram and Sayers 2001). Furthermore, the Australian Council for Education Leaders (2003) pleads that OKM denotes the following procedures: knowing what, knowing how, knowing who, knowing when, knowing where, knowing why. Thus, according to Carroll et al. (2001) OKM engages new roles and responsibilities, managerial guidelines, and supervising an innovative workplace culture.

2.2. Dimensions

2.2.1 Organizational culture

In spite of culture's multiple dimensions and intricacy, the authors agree at some degree with the definition of Okunoye (2003), because it combines culture as: heritage, social learning, behavioural patterns, a belief, information, and physical environment. For, Okunoye (2003) culture is a set of basic assumptions formed from a collective programming of the mind, resulting from the social interaction of people and groups in society. Therefore, the reader may claim that is notorious the influence of Hofstede's (2001) work, which is truth, allowing Okunoye to integrate global and local diversity that characterizes contemporary society.

Hitherto, despite this stimulating contribution the authors consider several significant critics:

- is a "spherical" idea (symbolic perception), and therefore does not replicate KM ethical and social challenges;
- does not admit that organizational variables have an essential repercussion in OKM, in which collective versus individual actions engender tensions (ethical and social dilemmas);
- does not ascribe the technological facet which illustrates the network society. Organizational structures like virtual communities entail intricacy and trust in order to encourage knowledge sharing.

2.2.2 Technology

In spite of knowledge management systems (KMS) sustain OKM, being a crucial component of organizational procedures, it is feasible to claim that distinct organizational schemes may underline dissimilar outcomes; and logically, the bond of KM to technology is considered a main concern (Alavi and Leidner 2001).

Nevertheless, KMS main stream literature has been approaching: specific technical features and functionalities, as well as design; empirical studies as regards to knowledge transfer between users and systems; decision support systems for KM; or, still their generational evolution. Moreover, the existing perceptions of KMS merely underline technical issues or else, cost/benefit analysis, which ethical procedures for design are under enquiry by the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) code of ethics, or the auditing system SODIS (Gotterbarn, Clear and Kwan 2008). Yet, ethical topics about user's relationship with KMS technology remain entirely neglected, despite being a critical risk regarding KMS implementation.

2.2.3 Ethics

According to the authors it is possible to conclude that ethics acts simultaneously as a transverse and a unifying element. About the notion itself, various philosophers employ the word "morality" and "ethics" interchangeably, and others formulate a distinction (Pojman 1994).

So, it is logical to highlight both perspectives: the non-unitary pleads that ethics embraces "common good", and moral adjusts our behaviours in order to accomplish it (Stahl 2002); and, the unitary admits an equivalent significance (Rossouw 2002). Nevertheless, a theoretical assumption is not satisfactory to discern about a latent issue, because our primary ideas ought to be characterized as moral abstract instincts and require ethical legitimacy, which moral convictions will accept or not (Stahl 2008). Although, Stahl (2008) refers that an ethical validation is considered adequate as regards to universal principles of reflection. Moving forward, the authors advocate the non-unitary

perception, in which the minimum notion of morality is, at the very least, the endeavour of a person's behaviour through reason; in spite of award identical weight to the interests of each individual who will be affected by his decision (individual ethics) (Rachels and Rachels 2007).

2.3 Ethical issues and social dilemmas

KM literature refers that tacit knowledge must be excluded from manageable OKM (KPMG 2002). Despite potential critics, Wang (2004) acknowledges that ethics and self-interest are counter-determinants for knowledge sharing. Thus, the ethics of knowledge transfers and conversions become extremely important due to the individual losing sole rights to knowledge.

In that sense, du Plessis, Britz and Davel (2007) claim that knowledge workers have the right to express their ideas in order to create knowledge, as well as its organizations duty to create a knowledge atmosphere. Or, Ford and Staples (2005) argue that knowledge workers have the responsibility to share their ideas with colleagues. Moreover, despite organizational obligation to fairly protect its economic moral interests, knowledge workers have the right to be fairly compensated (Blyth 2005), as well as to privacy, autonomy and dignity within knowledge sharing cultures (Baskerville and Dulipovici 2006).

On the other hand, it is complex to separate the dissimilar motivations and the type of social interaction in existing social dilemmas (Manski 2000). Often individual conduct is simultaneously determined by some motives or, these motives vary according each individual despite a similar context (Mooradian, Renzl and Matzler 2006). The identification of pre-conditions for successful cooperation is thus a major challenge. With extensive empirical research Ostrom (2000) have been able to identify those conditions, as well as the role of trust to support sharing.

3. Empirical Procedures

3.1 Methodological design

This project resumes a descriptive investigation because the research problem is notorious, although the researcher is not entirely conscious of the circumstances (Zikmund and Zikmund 2000), as well as explanatory because it aims to portray certain evidences from unlike insights (Yin 1994).

The epistemological selection that consents subjectivity and questioning in its outcomes is a mishmash of interpretative and critical theory. Interpretive study glances for significance in context-the theme ought to be set in its social and historical background, in order to the Reader become aware of how the existing situation emerged (Klein and Myers 1999); although Sandberg (2005) enquiries about the output of this approach. The awareness of social reality is an imperative "building block" of critical research that can be found in numerous narratives of critical research (Hirschheim and Klein 1994).

An embedded multiple-case study (Yin 1994) was assumed, as well as Myers (1997) procedures as regards to case study method. Beyond this argument, grounded theory has its roots in social sciences (Chenitz and Swanson 1986), particularly in interpretative tradition of symbolic interactionism (Benoliel 1996). Following Glaser and Strauss (1967), grounded theory recognizes that a theoretical framework is produced from data rather than earlier research, as well as the researcher can regulate data collection throughout the research process, that is, the researcher drops artificial leads or asks additional incisive questions as required.

3.2 Data collection

3.2.1 Methods

According to Burns (2000) entail an oral exchange, in which an interviewer attempts to extort information about values or opinions of that individual, namely in semi-structured interviews. Furthermore questionnaires may assume multiple forms as for instance: web questionnaires, multiple choice, ask for agreement questions, etc. (Macionis and Plummer 1998). Therefore, data collection methods entail a combination of: semi-structured interviews to managers; and, web questionnaires comprising a mix of multiple choice and ask for agreement questions to workers. Although, Yin (1994) claims that interviews and questionnaires acknowledge a variety of risks, leading to a necessary pilot study with pre-testing. This is consistent with the sensitive nature of the research project.

Despite this argument, is crucial to integrate the data collection methods with the actual research, as well as to illustrate analogous studies in order to obtain a plausible and effective explanation. Semi-structured interviews to managers will allow an understanding of their perception concerning organizational culture, as reported by Squier (2003). Moreover, multiple choice questionnaires will allow observing employees' perceptions of the organizational culture (Wang 2007). Finally, for a pilot study appliance concerning managers' and employees' behaviours and values the authors' refer the work of Waldström (2003).

3.2.2 Constraints

Pilot studies (questionnaires and interviews) have occurred during June 2009, and encompassed the following sampling conditions: 25 per cent of the population inside a single learning organization (A). The intention about sample reliability was to have an equivalent weight regarding each focus groups (top management: 30%; middle management: 30%; workers: 40%); and, each respondent should have at least five years of professional experience, as well as must be working inside the chosen learning organization.

Beyond the previous conditions, the authors' had performed two interviews outside company A in order to fine-tune the interview protocol: one to a former human resources manager within a different learning organization (B); and, to a middle manager inside a non-learning organization (C). Beyond the aim of fine-tune the interview protocol, these two interviews allowed to understand possible differences between a non-learning and learning organization. Afterwards, the interview to top manager of A endorsed a comparison with the questionnaires results in order to achieve a higher level of confidence and reliability.

3.3 Empirical outcomes

3.3.1 Analytical procedures

At this stage and despite the previous arguments, it is mandatory to refer the analytical procedures that promoted the pilot studies results:

- questions analysis- questions have been categorized, combined and analyzed through grounded theory (creating several taxonomies and understand their bonds);
- answers content analysis- highlighted a qualitative analysis for all queries, although each set of questions had a divergent mishmash of methods. Multiple choice questions were analysed through a numerical inference regarding a generic and group analysis. Ask for agreement questions were legitimated through a hermeneutical analysis;

As a result it is possible to acknowledge three primary conclusions:

- sampling conditions- were fully accomplished. Even so, the authors' report that the population of A were around 100 workers, being produced 28 questionnaires from which 25 were legitimated;
- questions analysis- no revisions were introduced into the answers, which demonstrates a high level of reliability;
- answers content analysis- the results have confirmed what literature suggests, the existence of various ethical issues and social dilemmas.

3.3.2 Outcomes

Pilot studies outcomes will be presented through the following steps: a numerical analysis for the multiple choice questions by focus groups; ask for agreement queries content analysis; and finally, the pilot interview content analysis. The reason for these procedures is to permit a more indulgent and comprehensible argument regarding each queries results, as well concerning the pilot study interview. Nevertheless, beyond these considerations it is crucial to introduce the existing queries, which will occur simultaneously with their analysis. Therefore, the multiple choice results were:

- do you consider that workers may express themselves and have free access concerning the organizational body of knowledge?- 75% of managers claim that often and always, although 31% of workers state rarely;
- do you consider that workers autonomy, dignity are recognized into the organizational knowledge?- combining often and always represents 50% of managers, however 38% of workers claim rarely;
- do you consider that workers privacy is recognized into the organizational knowledge?- again 75% of managers refer often and always, and for workers rarely represented 23%;
- do you consider that your personal experience lived within the organization is organizational intellectual property?- managers state often and usually (100%), nevertheless over 60% of workers engage never or rarely;
- do you consider that knowledge creation, management and sharing into the organizational environment are fairly rewarded?- managers presented a single answer (usually). Despite this perception over 60% of workers claimed rarely;
- do you consider that workers who do not proceed to knowledge creation, management and sharing are sanctioned?- a clear division between managers have occurred: usually and

rarely corresponded to 50%, as well as rarely. Despite the awareness of some managers, 100% of workers referred rarely or never;

- do you consider that employees feel that exists a culture of trust into the organizational environment?- 100% of managers believed in this claim, although almost 40% of workers said otherwise (rarely);
- do you consider that a culture of trust is vital to allow knowledge creation, management and sharing into the organizational environment?- a clear understanding by both focus groups, because usually and often acknowledged 100%;
- do you consider that top management and workers feel confident into their mutually organizational relationship?- another critical query, because mixing often and usually for managers symbolized 100%, and over 60% of workers declared never or rarely;
- do you consider that organizational values represent a culture of trust into the organizational environment?- both focus clearly believed that is a fundamental issue, because combining usually, often and always meant 100% for managers and 84% for workers.

As regards to ask for agreement questions, the authors' illustrate two keen examples for each focus group (managers and workers). Nonetheless, the authors' believe that translation must be avoided in order to minimize the potential loss of sensitive meanings. Hence, the content analysis results were:

- state what is meant to be a fair compensation or a fair sanction regarding the knowledge creation, management and sharing process in an organizational environment?

Manager: *"Justa recompensa surge através de factores monetários e não monetários. Justa penalização corresponde a não ter direito"*. Demonstrated the recognition concerning reward dimensions; however the absence of sanction, entails workers perception.

Worker: *"(...) objecto de trabalho raramente é recompensado seja por estímulo oral seja por valores compensatórios (...)"*. The confirmation of numerical analysis, leading to a dilemma.

- in your opinion, does the organizational code of ethics or conduct (written or tacit) clearly demonstrate the possible dilemmas concerning the process of knowledge creation, management and sharing, particularly at an individual level?

Manager: *"Sim. O código de conduta expressa de forma clara os aspectos mencionados"*. A perception that confirms manager's numerical analysis.

Worker: *"Não, a maior parte dos sistemas para o efeito geralmente postos em prática pelos recursos humanos são vistos pelos indivíduos com alguma capacidade ou função de gerência de pessoas como algo "chato" e desnecessário"*. Tension between personal and collective knowledge.

- refer if you consider that ethical decisions may change according to the role and the context of knowledge creation, management and sharing. And, in which way such decisions affect organizational trust?

Manager: *"Não necessariamente. Em termos de ética há um tronco comum que se mantém e serve de fio condutor às decisões"*. A clear bound between ethical decision making and organizational trust.

Worker: *"Eventualmente podem mudar (dependendo dos envolvidos). Estas decisões afectam a confiança na cultura organizacional porque, quando não são coerentes, a descredibilizam"*. Resumes the workers perception regarding mutual confidence.

- in your opinion, does the organizational code of ethics or conduct allow a "transparent" relationship regarding all the stakeholders?

Manager: *"Sim, o código de conduta estabelece as directrizes para um modo de actuação claro e transparente"*. The evidence that organizational codes act as enablers for organizational transparency.

Worker: *"A transparência existe no entanto a falta de interacção ou por outras palavras a atitude dos vários departamentos previnem muitas vezes a criação e principalmente a partilha de ideias fundamentais para o negócio junto dos stakeholders"*. Trust as a key issue in organizational relations.

Finally, it is time to emphasize some quotations concerning the organizational pilot interview, as well as to expose the authors' perception pertaining to some key remarks:

- do you consider that workers autonomy, dignity are recognized into the organizational knowledge?

"Pessoas que entraram muito jovens (...) estabeleceram muitas relações pessoais para além das profissionais (...) há uma mistura da autonomia com a privacidade (...) dizer que é um perigo". The thin bond between autonomy and privacy and its identification.

- do you consider that workers privacy is recognized into the organizational knowledge?

"A curto/médio prazo a empresa tem intenções de monitorizar a rede social da empresa". Organizational technologies can enhance privacy issues.

- do you consider that your personal experience lived within the organization is organizational intellectual property?

"Projecto piloto (...), banco de ideias, em que estimula as ideias (...) mas cede a propriedade à organização". Personal versus organizational knowledge management engages a difficult trend, and is bounded to autonomy, dignity, privacy, and even fair compensation.

- do you consider that knowledge creation, management and sharing into the organizational environment are fairly rewarded?

"Tudo depende do impacto e das próprias pessoas em causa". It illustrates individuality, raising several ethical issues, like equity.

- do you consider that top management and workers feel confident into their mutually organizational relationship?

"Não esperaria um número muito elevado de mútua confiança, (...) da parte dos colaboradores para a gestão". Managers recognition that organizational trust is extremely difficult to cope, leading to a serious social dilemma.

- refer if you consider that ethical decisions may change according to the role and the context of knowledge creation, management and sharing. And, in which way such decisions affect organizational trust?

"Tem que haver coerência (...) pela comunicação". Interesting that ethical decision making is bounded to communication; however, and behaviour?

3.3.3 Rigor and liability

The mixed decision (qualitative and quantitative analysis) is defensible throughout the following argument: if a researcher emphasizes an in-depth insight concerning an event, it might select a diminutive however informative example. Otherwise, the researcher might also utilize a mere inferential numerical analysis to enumerate the results (Creswell 2003), which justifies the authors' choice. Nevertheless, the reference to a "numerical analysis" logically imposes a philosophical, cultural and even psychological concern (Alaranta 2006) due to practical problems that multiple methods impose. Therefore, the authors' believe that is vital to portrait the reasons that justify their belief: questionnaire "design", answers reliability verification, answers content analysis, and philosophical argument.

The questionnaires "design", its sections (participant profiling, KM and organizational culture) and queries characteristics (multiple choice and ask for agreement), intended to grasp individual ethical conduct and its impact within an organization, which is similar to qualitative and numerical approach of Šuc, Vladošič and Bratko (2004). To verify answers reliability, the authors' have drawn a table that contrasts respondent's data profiling (organizational position, what you value most and organizational role) with their responses (close or open) of each section, as well as concurrently both sections to examine potential conflicting opinions and beliefs (interpretative flexibility) (Doherty et al. 2006). For queries content analysis, the authors' followed the claim of Strauss and Corbin (1998: 178) that: "the

adaptation of grounded theory will include its combination with other methodologies including phenomenology and hermeneutics”, meaning that grounded theory can interact as the missing bond in interpretative research (Goulding, 1998). Concerning the philosophical argument, the authors’ acknowledge abduction (equal to inference of a cause in order to explain a consequence), which admits several explanations along with some incorrect results (Zait and Zait 2009). Despite all these arguments, the authors’ are aware that “non-main stream” data analysis is a challenge regarding rigor within a PhD research (Bowen 2005).

4. Conclusion

Regardless the nature that this paper configures, an ongoing research project, it is reasonable to recognize numerous noteworthy results. For that, the authors will admit an analogous justification among the research question versus: literature; research design structure and data collection methods; empirical outcomes; and, authors’ insight with reference to upcoming case studies.

The relationship between individual and organizational knowledge probably thwarts knowledge creation, managing and sharing within organizational contexts, as well as enables ethical concerns and social quandaries, challenging laboratory testing and observations of daily life. Moving forward, the research design configuration appears to retort optimistically, particularly the assorted option pertaining to data collection and analysis. Furthermore, the empirical outcomes confirm the existence of substantial ethical topics and social predicaments inside organizations which managers do not understand or ignore, leading to an imperative belief by the authors: these “old” and “novel” dilemmas will be corroborated into future case studies. In conclusion, comments will be welcome during the presentation.

Acknowledgements

The first co-author would like to distinguish the remarkable endeavour of Ms. Mary Prior and Professor Simon Rogerson regarding their support and supervision throughout his PhD project, as well as to Nuno Silva for his insightful comments and critics. Also thanks to ISLA Leiria for its financial assistance about ECKM 2010.

References

- Alaranta, M. (2006) “Combining Theory-Testing and Theory-Building Analyses of Case Study Data”, [online], London School of Economics and Political, <http://is2.lse.ac.uk/asp/aspecis/20060059.pdf>.
- Alavi, M. and Leidner, D. (2001) “Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues”, *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 107-136.
- Australian Council for Education Leaders (2003) *Response to the Discussion Paper: Young People, Schools and Innovation- Towards an Action Plan for the School Sector*, Association of Independent Schools of Queensland, Queensland.
- Baskerville, R. and Dulipovici, A. (2006) *The Ethics of Knowledge Transfers and Conversions: Property or Privacy Rights*, In VanLehn, K. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 39th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, IEEE, Hawaii, pp. 144-152.
- Benoliel, J. (1996) “Grounded Theory and Nursing Knowledge”, *Qualitative Health Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 406-428.
- Blyth, A. (2005) “Business Behaving Responsibly”, *Director*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 30.
- Bowen, G. (2005) “Preparing a Qualitative Research-Based Dissertation: Lessons Learned”, *The Qualitative Report*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 208-222.
- Burns, R. (2000) *Introduction to Research Methods*, Sage Publishers, London.
- Carroll, J. et al. (2001) “Knowledge Management Support for Teachers”, [online], Virginia Tech Center for Human-Computer Interaction, <http://java.cs.vt.edu/public/classes/communities/readings/KM4Teachers-ETRD03.pdf>.
- Chenitz, W. and Swanson, J. (1986) *From Practice to Grounded Theory: Qualitative Research in Nursing*, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley.
- Cram, J. and Sayers, R. (2001) “Creating and Managing Context: The Use of Knowledge Management Principles to Deliver Virtual Information Services to Schools”, Paper read at ASLA XVII Conference, Queensland, Australia, October.
- Creswell, J. (2003) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, 2nd ed, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Doherty, N. et al. (2006) “A Re-Conceptualization of the Interpretative Flexibility of Information Technologies: Redressing the Balance Between the Social and the Technical”, *European Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 15, No. 6, pp. 569-582.

- du Plessis, J.C., Britz, J.J. and Davel, R. (2007) *Slave or Sibling: A Moral Reframing the Corporate Knowledge Sharing Community*, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.
- Efimova, L. (2005) *Understanding Personal Knowledge Management: A Weblog Case*, Telematica Instituut, Enschede.
- Ford, D.P. and Staples, D.S. (2005) *Perceived Value of Knowledge: Shall I Give You My Gem, My Coal?*, In Arbeitspapiere, W. (Ed.), Proceedings of 38th Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences, IEEE, Hawaii, pp. 247-256.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, New York, Aldine De Gruyter.
- Gotterbarn, D., Clear, T. and Kwan, C-T. (2008) *A Practical Mechanism for Ethical Risk Assessment- A SoDIS Inspection*, In Himma, K. and Tavani, H. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Information and Computer Ethics*, Wiley, New Jersey, pp. 429-472.
- Goulding, C. (1998) "Grounded Theory: The Missing Methodology Interpretivist Agenda", *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 50-57.
- Higgison, S. (2005) "Your Say: Personal Knowledge Management", [online], Insight Knowledge, <http://www.ikmagazine.com/xq/asp/sid.0/volume.7/issue.7/qx/displayissue.htm>.
- Hirschheim, R. and Klein, H. (1994) "Realizing Emancipatory Principles in Information Systems Development: The Case for Ethics", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 83-109.
- Hofstede, G. (Ed.) (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Jones, W. and Bruce, H. (2005) "A Report on the NSF Sponsored Workshop on Personal Information Management", Report read at NSF Workshop on Personal Information Management, Seattle, US, January.
- Klein, H. and Myers, M. (1999) "A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information Systems", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 67-93.
- KPMG (2002) *Intellectual Gold- KPMG's European Intellectual Property Survey Reveals the Value Hidden in Europe's Leading Companies*, KPMG, London.
- Macionis, J. and Plummer, K. (1998) *Sociology: A Global Introduction*, Prentice Hall Inc., New Jersey.
- Manski, C.F. (2000) "Economic Analysis of Social Interactions", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 115-136.
- Mooradian, T., Renzl, B. and Matzler, K. (2006) "Who Trusts? Personality, Trust and Knowledge Sharing", *Management Learning*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 523-540.
- Myers, M. (1997) "Qualitative research in information systems", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 241-242.
- Okunoye, A. (2003) *Knowledge Management and Global Diversity: A Framework to Support Organizations in Developing Countries*, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Turku, Turku.
- Ostrom, E. (2000) "Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 137-158.
- Pojman, L. (1994) *Ethical Theory: Classical and Contemporary Readings*, 2nd ed, Thomson Wadsworth, Belmont.
- Polanyi, M. (1958) *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Ponzi, L. and Koenig, M. (2002) "Knowledge Management: Another Management Fad?", [online], Information Research, <http://InformationR.net/ir/8-1/paper145.html>.
- Poston, R.S. and Speier, C. (2005) "Effective Use of Knowledge Management Systems: A Process Model of Content Ratings and Credibility Indicators", *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 221-244.
- Rachels, J. and Rachels, S. (Eds.) (2007) *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, 5th ed, McGraw-Hill International Edition, New York.
- Rossouw, D. (2002) *Business Ethics in Africa*, 2nd ed, Oxford University Press, Cape Town.
- Sandberg, J. (2005) "How Do We Justify Knowledge Produced Within Interpretative Approaches?", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 41-68.
- Sinclair, N. (2008) "The Changing Face of KM", *VINE: The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 22-29.
- Squier, M.M. (2003) *The Principles and Practice of Knowledge Management*, Unpublished MIS thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Stahl, B.C. (2002) "Ethical Issues in E-Teaching: A Theoretical Framework", [online], CSE, www.cse.dmu.ac.uk/~bstahl/publications/2002_Ethics_eteaching_framework.PDF.
- Stahl, B.C. (2008) "Researching Ethics and Morality in Information Systems: Some Guiding Questions", [online], AISEL, <http://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2008/175>.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory, Procedures and Techniques*, Sage Publications, Newbury Park.

- Šuc, D., Vladušič, D. and Bratko, I. (2004) "Qualitatively Faithful Quantitative Prediction", *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 158, No. 2, pp. 189-214.
- Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K. and Nonaka, I. (2000) *Enabling Knowledge Creation: How to Unlock the Mystery of Tacit Knowledge and Release the Power of Innovation*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Waldström, C. (2003) *Understanding Intra-Organizational Relations Through Social Network Analysis*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Aarhus University, Aarhus.
- Wang, C-C. (2004) "The Influence of Ethical and Self-Interest Concerns on Knowledge Sharing Intentions Among Managers: An Empirical Study", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 370-381.
- Wang, Y. (2007) *Knowledge Management from Theory to Practice. A Road Map for Small and Medium Sized Enterprise*, Unpublished master thesis, Väskö University, Väskö.
- Yin, R. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 3rd ed, Thousand Oaks, Sage.
- Zait, D. and Zait, A. (2009) "Research Anticipation: The Methodological Choice", *Review of International Comparative Management*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 902-909.
- Zikmund, W. and Zikmund, E. (2000) *Business Research Methods*, 6th ed, Dryden Press, London.