# References

Ajjan, H and Hartshorne, R. 2008. Investigating faculty decisions to adopt Web 2.0 technologies: Theory and empirical tests. *Internet and Higher Education,* no.11: 71-80.

Alexander, B. 2006. A new way of innovation for teaching and learning. *Educause Review* 41, no.2: 32-44.

Casarez, Vince, Cripe, Billy, Sini, Jean and Wecherle, Phillipp.2009. *Reshaping Your Business with Web 2.0*.New York: McGrawHill.

Daniel, D. How CIOs Can Introduce Web 2.0 Technologies into the Enterprise. CIO. http://www.cio.com/article/120850/How_CIOs_Can_Introduce_Web_._Technologies_into_the_Enterprise_?page=1 [accessed March 25, 2009].

Davenport, T. Why Enterprise 2.0 Won't Transform Organisation. Harvard Business Online. http://discussionleader.hbsp.com/davenport/2007/03/why_enterprise_20_wont_transfo.html [accessed April 03, 2009].

Dimitris, Bibikas, Dimitrios, Kourtesis, Iraklis, Paraskakis, Ansgar, Bernardi, Leo, Sauermann, Dimitris, Apostolou, Gregoris, Mentzas and Ana, Vasconcelos. 2008. Organizatonal Knowledge Management Systems in the Era of Enterprise 2.0: The case of OrganiK .Paper presented at the 11th Conference on Business Information Systems, Innsbruck, Austri. 6-7 May.

Du, Helen and Wagner, Christian. 2006. Weblog success: Exploring the role of technology. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies 64:*789-798.

Dwivedi, A, Bali,R, James, A, Naguib, R and Jahnson,D. 2002. Merger of Knowledge Management and Information Technology in Healthcare: Opportunities and Challenges. *Proc of the IEEE Canadian Conference on Electrical and Computer Engineering,* no 2:1194-1199.

E-Surveys Pro 2009. Research Survey. (http://www.eSurveysPro.com/Survey.aspx?id=8e04ce36-774d-4a76-9e35-cb6b4b011bc5 [accessed 17 November, 2009].

Farber, D. Web 2.0 = a piece of jargon. ZDNet. http://blogs.zdnet.com/BTL/?p=3552 [accessed 15 October, 2009].

Freidman, Thomas. 2005. *The World isFlat*.London: Penguin Group.

Furneaux, Brent. Theory of Planned Behavior. University of York. http://www.istheory.yorku.ca/theoryofplannedbehavior.htm [accessed October 27,2009].

Gotta, Mike. 2007. *Enterprise 2.0: Collaboration and Knowledge Management Renaissance*. Utah: Burton Group.

Hinchcliffe, D. The state of Enterprise 2.0. BNET Business Network. http://blogs.zdnet.com/Hinchcliffe/?p=143 [accessed March 25, 2009].

Idinopulos, Michael. Transparent Office. Sociatext. http://michaeli.typepad.com/ [accessed October 15,2009].

Jaschke, Robert, Hotho, Andreas, Schmitz, Christoph, Ganter, Bernhard and Stumme, Gerd. 2008. Discovering shared conceptualizations in folksonomies. *Journal of Web Semantics ,* no 6: 38-53.

Knowledge Management, Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_management [accessed 12 August, 2009].

Koch, Michael. 2008. CSCW and Enterprise 2.0 – towards and integrated perspective. Paper presented at the 21th Bled eConference conference on Overcoming Boundaries Through Multi-Channel Interaction, Bled, Slovania. 15- 18 June.

Levy, Moria. 2007. Web 2.0 implications on knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 13: 120-134.

Mao, Isaac. 2008. Censorship Meets Sharism. Paper presented at Web 2.0 Summit. San Francisco, 5 – 7 Nov. http://en.oreilly.com/web2008/public/schedule/proceedings  [accessed December 05, 2008].

McAfee, Andrew.2006. Enterprise 2.0: The Dawn of Emergent Collaboration. *MITSloan Management Review* 47, no.3: 21-28.

McNurlin, Barbara and Sprague, Ralph. 2004. *Information Systems Management in Practice*. New Jersey:Pearson.

Newman, Aaron and Thomas, Jeremy.2009. *Enterprise 2.0 Implementation.* New York: McGrawHill.

Shuen, Amy. 2008. *Web 2.0: A Strategy Guide*. California: O'Reilly.

Sri Lanka Information and Communication Technology Agency, 2007. Rising Demand: The ICT Workforce survey 2007, Sri Lanka Information and Communication Technology Agency.

Stankosky, Michael. 2005. *Creating the Discipline of Knowledge Management: The Latest in University Research*. Burlington:Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Stocker, Alexander and Tochtermann, Klaus. 2008. Investigating Weblogs in Small and Medium Enterprises: An Exploratory Case Study. Paper presented at the 11th Conference on Business Information Systems, Innsbruck, Austri. 6-7 May.

Tapscott, Don, 2006, Winning with the Enterprise 2.0, New Paradigm Learning Corporation.

The Survey System. Sample Size Calculator. http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm [accessed 15 June, 2009].

Web 2.0,Wikipedia. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_2.0 [accessed 02 December, 2008].

Wylie, S. Enterprise 2.0 Conference. http://www.e2conf.com [accessed March 31, 2009].

Young, G. 2008. Global Enterprise web 2.0. Forrester.
http://www.forrester.com/Research/Document/Excerpt/0,7211,43850,00.html [accessed March 27, 2009].

# Appendix 1 - Questionnaire

L1. What is your organization Name?

OrgCA1. How many employees are there?

            < 25

26     - 50

51     - 75

76     - 100

101   <

OrgCA2. Company's Length of time in business?

< 5

6 - 10

11 - 15

16 - 20

>20

L2. Is your company currently using any of the following web 2.0 technologies or tools for core business functions?

1 - Not in Use    2 - Little Used    3 - Limitedly Used    4 - Averagely Used    5 - Widely Used

Blogs

RSS

Wikis

Social Networking

Social Bookmarking

Mash-ups

Collaborative Planning Software

Folksonomy

L3. Please specify if there's any other enterprise 2.0 tools that you are using in your organization and its level of adaptation

L4. I frequently search wikis, blogs created by colleagues for work requirement
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -
Agree                     5 - Strongly Agree

L5. I frequently participate to wikis, blogs with my expert knowledge with the intention of helping my co-workers' job.
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -
Agree                     5 - Strongly Agree

L6. Most often I find relevant useful information from enterprise 2.0 tools
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -
Agree                     5 - Strongly Agree

 L7. I get enough support from my colleagues through enterprise 2.0
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -
Agree                     5 - Strongly Agree

L8. We are interacting with our customers using enterprise 2.0 tools (wiki/blog/social networking)
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -
Agree                     5 - Strongly Agree

L9. Does your organization use collaboration platforms to edit/read internal documents?
 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree        3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree     4     -     Agree
        5 - Strongly Agree

AttPU1. Enterprise 2.0 helps me to work efficiently and saves office time

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttPU2. I feel that enterprise 2.0 improves job satisfaction

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttPE1. I feel it is difficult to adapt to enterprise 2.0

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttPE2. I need additional technical expertise to adapt to the enterprise 2.0

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttPE3. I got enough training (formal or informal) on using enterprise 2.0 technologies

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttComp1. I think my organization requires better collaboration techniques for knowledge /information sharing.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

AttComp2. Using Enterprise 2.0 technologies fit well with my general work.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

SubSOI1. Sub-ordinates who are important to me think that I should use enterprise 2.0 for official purpose.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

SubPI1. My peers think I will benefit from using enterprise 2.0 for official purpose.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree

SubSI1. I'm rewarded (in any means) by the management for **using** enterprise 2.0 tools.

 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4       - Agree                5 - Strongly Agree

SubSI2.  I'm rewarded (in any means) by the management for **contributing** on enterprise 2.0 tools.

 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4       - Agree                5 - Strongly Agree

PBConSE1. I use the web 2.0 application for personal use generally, other than office work

 1 - Strogly Disagree                2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4       - Agree                5 - Strongly Agree

PBConSE2. I feel comfortable using Enterprise 2.0 technologies.

1 - Strogly Disagree        2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4      -      Agree
          5 - Strongly Agree

PBConFR1. I can use Enterprise 2.0 technologies using any computer connected to the network

1 - Strogly Disagree            2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree        4      -      Agree
          5 - Strongly Agree

PBConFT1. The Enterprise 2.0 technologies are compatible with the computer and other frequently used devices that I already use.

1 - Strogly Disagree        2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4      -      Agree
          5 - Strongly Agree

OrgAM1. My organization has a flat hierarchy

        1 - Strogly Disagree          2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree        4 - Agree
 5 - Strongly Agree

OrgAM2. Does your company have best practices/standards/policy for using enterprise 2.0?

1 - Strogly Disagree        2 - Disagree                3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree      4      -      Agree
5 - Strongly Agree

OrgGP1. The employees in my organization are spread out in different parts of Sri Lanka either due to being stationed in clients' site or working in branches.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


OrgGP2. My organization interacts with a large number of global partners

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


IntINT1. I intended to use Enterprise 2.0 technologies within the next six months.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


IntEXP1. I expect more Enterprise 2.0 technologies would be introduced by the management.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


IntWILL1. If more enterprise 2.0 technologies available within my organization right now, I'm willing to use them.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


AdpCON1. I believe that I could communicate to others the consequences of using Enterprise 2.0.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


AdpCON2. I would have no difficulty explaining why Enterprise 2.0 technologies may or may not be beneficial.

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


KmID1. Do you analyze customer data (data mining) for decision making?

1 - Strogly Disagree 2 - Disagree 3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree 4 - Agree 5 - Strongly Agree


KmID2. Do you think enterprise 2.0 tools can help to analyze customer data (data mining) ?

1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmCR1. Our organization treats the personal experience as a knowledge asset.

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmCR2. Enterprise 2.0 helps to flow the personal experience to the employees.

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmCL1. My management tries to collect expert ideas from all the relevant employees when they need to building a new concept.

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmCL2. Enterprise 2.0 helps to collect expert ideas for building new concepts.

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmST1. The knowledge based documents of the projects are properly managed with versions

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

 KmST2. Enterprise 2.0 tools make it easy to manage project based documents with versions

1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    -    Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmAC1. Do you identify any informal groups formed in your organization with common interest ?

 1 - Strogly Disagree      2 - Disagree      3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree      5 - Strongly Agree

KmAC2. Cooperate social network play vital role to identifying experts in the organization.

64

1 - Strogly Disagree       2 - Disagree       3 - Neither Agree Nor Disagree    4    - Agree       5 - Strongly Agree

Please provide the following demographic details about yourself.

D1. Gender *

     Male     Female

D2. Which of the following age group do you belong to?

     Below 20 years

     21 - 24 years

     25 - 28 years

     29 - 31 years

     32 - 35 years

     36 - 39 years

     Over 39 years

D3. What is your highest educational qualification?

     High School

     Diploma

     Graduate

     Post Graduate

D4. Which of the following best describes your title?

     Technician

     Engineer/ Executive

     Manager

     Head /CIO

D5. Comments

# Glossary of Terms

**BLOG**

A blog (a contraction of the term weblog) is a type of website with regular entries of commentary, descriptions of events, or other material such as graphics or video. Entries are commonly displayed in reverse-chronological order.

*Corporate blogs*

A blog can be private, as in most cases, or it can be for business purposes. Blogs, either used internally to enhance the communication and culture in a corporation or externally for marketing, branding or public relations purposes are called corporate blogs.

*Question blogging*

is a type of blog that answers questions. Questions can be submitted in the form of a submittal form, or through email or other means such as telephone or VOIP. Qlogs can be used to display shownotes from podcast or the means of conveying information through the internet. Many question logs use syndication such as RSS as a means of conveying answers to questions
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blog

**RSS**

(abbreviation for Really Simple Syndication) is a family of Web feed formats used to publish frequently updated works—such as blog entries, news headlines, audio, and video—in a standardized format. An RSS document (which is called a "feed", "web feed",or "channel") includes full or summarized text, plus metadata such as publishing dates and authorship. Web feeds benefit publishers by letting them syndicate content automatically. They benefit readers who want to subscribe to timely updates from favored websites or to aggregate feeds from many sites into one place. RSS feeds can be read using software called an "RSS reader", "feed reader", or "aggregator", which can be web-based, desktop-based, mobile device or any computerized Internet-connected device.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RSS_(file_format)

**WIKIS**

A wiki is a page or collection of Web pages designed to enable anyone who accesses it to contribute or modify content (excluding blocked users), using a simplified markup language. Wikis are often used to create collaborative websites and to power community websites. The

66

collaborative encyclopedia Wikipedia is one of the best-known wikis. Wikis are used in business to provide intranet and knowledge management systems.A wiki invites all users to edit any page or to create new pages within the wiki Web site, using only a plain-vanilla Web browser without any extra add-ons.

•        Wiki promotes meaningful topic associations between different pages by making page link creation almost intuitively easy and showing whether an intended target page exists or not.

•        A wiki is not a carefully crafted site for casual visitors. Instead, it seeks to involve the visitor in an ongoing process of creation and collaboration that constantly changes the Web site landscape.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikis

## SOCIAL NETWORKING

A social network service focuses on building online communities of people who share interests and/or activities, or who are interested in exploring the interests and activities of others.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_networking

## SOCIAL BOOKMARKING

Social bookmarking is a method for Internet users to store, organize, search, and manage bookmarks of web pages on the Internet with the help ofmetadata, typically in the form of tags that collectively and/or collaboratively become a folksonomy. Folksonomy is also called social tagging, "the process by which many users add metadata in the form of keywords to shared content".[1]

In a social bookmarking system, users save links to web pages that they want to remember and/or share. These bookmarks are usually public, and can be saved privately, shared only with specified people or groups, shared only inside certain networks, or another combination of public and private domains. The allowed people can usually view these bookmarks chronologically, by category or tags, or via a search engine.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_Bookmarking

## MASHUPS

In web development, a mashup is a Web application that combines data from one or more sources into a single integrated tool. The term Mashup implies easy, fast integration, frequently done by access to open APIs and data sources to produce results that were not the original reason for producing the raw source data. An example of a mashup is the use of cartographic data from Google Maps to add location information to real estate data, thereby creating a new and distinct Web service that was not originally provided by either source.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mashup_(web_application_hybrid)

## COLLABORATIVE PLANNING SOFTWARE

Collaborative planning software helps people plan projects and activities together on the peer base. Everyone can equally contribute, assign tasks and track the progress.

Collaborative planning software is a mixture of project management software, groupware and collaborative software. Tools such as "Wrike" enable users to organize projects and activities as project management tools, discuss, and work on. The added value of such software is that it allows you to decentralize control and responsibility for overall plans and permit online access to plans that is equal for all related participants. This type of tool is designed to use in cooperation with other people so the important trait is that several individuals may be aware of task specification and track the results of this task. Nevertheless project extranets and online spreadsheets may also be referred to collaborative planning software.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collaborative_planning_software

## FOLKSONOMY

Folksonomy (also known as collaborative tagging, social classification, social indexing, and social tagging) is the practice and method of collaboratively creating and managing tags to annotate and categorize content. Folksonomy describes the bottom-up classification systems that emerge from social tagging. In contrast to traditional subject indexing, metadata is generated not only by experts but also by creators and consumers of the content. Usually, freely chosen keywords are used instead of a controlled vocabulary.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Folksonomy

# Appendix 11 – Rules of Coding

| Concept | Parameter | Mark |
|---------|-----------|------|
| No of employees | < 25 | 1 |
| | 26 - 50 | 2 |
| | 51 – 75 | 3 |
| | 76 – 100 | 4 |
| | 101 < | 5 |
| Company's Length of time in business | < 5 | 1 |
| | 6 - 10 | 2 |
| | 11 - 15 | 3 |
| | 16 - 20 | 4 |
| | >20 | 5 |
| Level of Adoption - Blogs | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – RSS | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – Wikis | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – Social Networking | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – Social Bookmarking | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |

| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – Mash-ups | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption – Collaborative Planning Software | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Level of Adoption - Folksonomy | Not in Use | 1 |
| | Little Used | 2 |
| | Limitedly Used | 3 |
| | Averagely Used | 4 |
| | Widely Used | 5 |
| Frequency of searching | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Frequency of participating | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Perceived Usefulness 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Perceived Usefulness 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |

| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
|---|---|---|
| Perceived ease of use 1 | Strongly Disagree | 5 |
| | Disagree | 4 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 2 |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 |
| Perceived ease of use 2 | Strongly Disagree | 5 |
| | Disagree | 4 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 2 |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 |
| Perceived ease of use 3 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Compatibility 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Compatibility 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Sub-ordinate Influence | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Peer Influence | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Superior Influence 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |

71

| | Disagree | 2 |
|---|---|---|
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Superior Influence 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Self Efficacy 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Self Efficacy 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Facilitating Condition - Resources | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Facilitating Condition - Technology | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Intention | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Expectation | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Willingness | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Confidence 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Confidence 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Identify 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Identify 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Create 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Create 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |

| Collect 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Collect 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Store 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Store 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Access 1 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |
| Access 2 | Strongly Disagree | 1 |
| | Disagree | 2 |
| | Neither Agree Nor Disagree | 3 |
| | Agree | 4 |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 |