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Abstract

Despite the popularity of engaging in knowledge management among organisations, research indicates that the majority of knowledge management attempts have failed to deliver its promised effects. For almost a decade, the discipline has been struggling, with some researchers even regarding it as ‘the knowledge management graveyard’. Responding to the unsuccessful attempts, a new approach to knowledge management that uses Web 2.0 tools is emerging – a so-called KM 2.0 paradigm.

Building on Bougzhala & Limayem’s comparative framework, the purpose of the thesis is to examine the main differences between the traditional paradigm and KM 2.0 in terms of four main elements of knowledge management: knowledge, people, processes, and technology. In conclusion, the analysis exemplified how the shift in knowledge paradigm transforms other elements of KM into a new way of managing knowledge with a stronger emphasis on social interaction between people than capturing knowledge itself.

To provide an empirical example, the thesis also conducted a case study analysis of the global student organisation AIESEC, assessing the extent to which its intranet MyAIESEC.net follows the paradigm of KM 1.0 or KM 2.0. The analysis revealed that although incorporating Web 2.0 functionalities such as wikis, AIESEC’s intranet mainly functions as a knowledge repository for transfer of knowledge, thus predominantly adhering to KM 1.0. As a result, four problems in terms of knowledge sharing were identified: reluctance to share on MyAIESEC.net caused by a focus on collective intelligence, uncritical consumption of ‘best practice’ content ultimately leading to a stagnant platform, lack of common grounds between members making it difficult to share practices and an ineffective search function caused by a structure that failed to emerge. Subsequently, problems were addressed from a KM 2.0 perspective, with recommendations of focusing more on collaborative processes and collective intelligence.

The new paradigm presents a different approach to knowledge management by focusing on nurturing social relations between individuals to create knowledge instead of capturing it, and thus adds a different perspective to how knowledge can be managed in today’s competitive environment.
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1. Introduction

For several years, the discipline of Knowledge Management (KM) has been heralded as one of the most essential business processes that companies need to engage in to become proactive and stay ahead of competition. Consequently, many organisations have focused on capturing, sharing and utilising knowledge of individuals and teams through Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) to make it an available resource for the entire organisation to draw upon (Davenport & Prusak, 2000).

Despite few success stories, research indicates that the majority of KM attempts have failed to deliver its promised effects (Newell et al., 2009; Storey & Barnett, 2000; Davenport, 2005). For almost a decade, the field of KM has been struggling with organisations failing to manage their knowledge processes effectively (Levy, 2009). The repetitive failures have made parts of the research community regard the discipline as “the knowledge management graveyard” (De Brún, 2005, p. 59).

The unsuccessful initiatives have fuelled a need for a different approach to management of knowledge work. Inspired by a social constructivist perspective on knowledge, this paper argues that an evolutionary paradigm of KM, KM 2.0, is emerging using democratic Web 2.0 technologies. The most prominent difference between the traditional paradigm and KM 2.0 is the shifting understanding of what knowledge actually is. Whereas KM 1.0 follows a possession perspective focusing on knowledge as something people have, KM 2.0 follows a practice perspective, focusing on knowledge as something people do (Newell et al., 2009). These differing viewpoints of what knowledge is serve as the foundation of the two paradigms and consequently shape the three main elements of KM: people, processes, and technology (De Brún, 2005).

The purpose of this paper is thus to explain how the shifting understanding of knowledge changes each of these elements into a new conception of KM - one with a larger focus on people and their practices than knowledge itself. Building upon the framework of Bougzhala & Limayem (2010), a comparative analysis of KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 will be conducted to assess how organisations can avoid the ‘knowledge management graveyard’ by following the emerging paradigm and subsequently optimising their KM efforts. To provide an empirical example, the thesis will conduct a case study of the global student organisation AIESEC, assessing the extent to which its intranet MyAIESEC.net follows the paradigm of KM 1.0 and subsequently discussing how the organisation can optimise its KM efforts by shifting to a KM 2.0 mind-set rooted in social constructivism.
1.1 Problem statement

Considering the above introduction, the thesis has a two-fold purpose, which is:

1. To examine how the social constructivist perspective of knowledge is transforming the three main elements of KM: people, processes and technology into a new conception of KM, KM 2.0, focusing more on social interaction amongst people than capturing knowledge itself.

2. To examine how AIESEC can optimise its KM efforts by analysing its intranet MyAIESEC.net. More specifically, the thesis will assess to which extent MyAIESEC.net builds upon the traditional paradigm of KM, and discuss how shifting to KM 2.0 may improve its KM efforts.

1.2 Theory of scientific methods

The scientific approach, which this paper is based upon, is social constructivism. Though being an abstract concept, Burr (2001) suggests four key assumptions that define a social constructivist approach. These four assumptions have served as the foundation of the paper and thereby guided its creation. The first assumption proposes that "a critical stance towards taken-for-granted knowledge" should be employed (Burr, 2001, p. 3). This view challenges the objectivistic paradigm, by suggesting that all knowledge is socially constructed with support of the particular values and understandings people bring to the interpretation. Thus, knowledge can never be absolute or universal, but will always be "relative to cultures and contexts." (Jackson & Klobas, 2008, p. 330).

In the light of this key assumption, this paper does not have the purpose of creating an objective universal truth about the new KM paradigm. Instead, it is an illustration meant to create reflection among the readers by putting the subject into perspective from the social position of the author and the research participants.

The second key assumption advocates that our assumptions about the world and how we perceive it always will be "historically and culturally specific." (Burr, 2001, p. 3), and thus vary in interpretation. For example, how we understand the concept of life depends on the era we live in as well as the place in the world we live. This means that new knowledge such as experiences, expressions and ideas always will be processed in the light of our own existing knowledge base, which is rooted in the history and culture we are members of.

The third assumption posits that "knowledge is sustained by social processes" (Burr, 2001, p. 4), meaning that true knowledge is not something that exists and can be derived through research, but is something that is constructed as a product of social interactive processes between people (Burr, 2001). Thus, within this study it has been acknowledged that the researcher is an ac-
tive part of the construction process. The knowledge derived from the study is not predetermined facts extracted through interviews and observations, but is “a process of continual sense-making” in which the author and the research participants “build, communicate, verify and commit to mutually agreed views of the world.” (Jackson & Klobas, 2008, p. 329).

The final assumption insinuates that “knowledge and social action go together” (Burr, 2001, p. 4), emphasising that different ‘social constructions’ of the world bring out different types of behaviour, making it “impossible to ‘freeze’ a social setting and the circumstances of an initial study to make it replicable” (Bryman, 2001, p. 271). Due to the active role of the researcher in the analysis and the different socially constructed environments of organisations, the findings of the study are only completely applicable to the context of AIESEC. Conclusions of the study can however be used as inspiration for other scholars to build upon in other contexts and environments.

1.3 Theoretical framework

In order to answer the above problem statement, this paper will build upon the model of Bougzhala & Limayem (2010), which illustrates the main differences between KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 in terms of five dimensions: KM Scope, Nature of Knowledge, Place of the individual, Process, and Technology. The scope of the model is to describe the “changing trends in managing knowledge in the knowledge-based society and economy built on the collective intelligence and social capital, mainly related to the interpersonal knowledge.” (Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010, p. 1231). Subscribing to the social constructivist viewpoint, the model emphasises interpersonal relationships fostered through processes of “connection, interaction and collaboration of individuals” (p. 1231) as the main source of knowledge creation. Drawing on this framework, a comparative analysis of the traditional paradigm of KM and the new paradigm that KM is slowly evolving towards will be made.

Unlike the model presented by Bougzhala & Limayem, the analysis will only be divided into four dimensions: knowledge, people, processes, and technology, thus merging the dimensions KM Scope and Nature of Knowledge into one category. The three latter elements, people, processes, and technology are often viewed as the ‘holy threesome of knowledge management’ (De Brún, 2005; Hansen & Thompson, 2002), of which knowledge itself is seen as the overarching dimension permeating each of the three elements. Recognising that the four dimensions are interdependent, the framework seeks to create a holistic representation of the discipline of KM instead of only focusing on certain aspects. The findings of the comparative analysis will be used to explain the transition from KM 1.0 to KM 2.0, as well as to analyse MyAIESEC.net to determine how the organisation can optimise its knowledge behaviour by following KM 2.0 principles of people, processes and technology.
1.4 Structure

Section 2 functions as a contextual framework by providing short introductions to respectively knowledge, KM, and Web 2.0. Following this, section 3 consists of a holistic comparison of KM 1.0 and KM 2.0. Section 4 will describe the methodological approach of case studies that this thesis builds upon. This is followed by the case study analysis of MyAIESEC.net in section 5. The analysis will be based on the findings of the comparative analysis in section 3, but will be structured in reversed order, starting with the dimension that can be described through observation, namely technology. Section 6 discusses how AIESEC can improve its KM efforts by following a KM 2.0 paradigm, and section 7 summarises the results of the preceding sections. Lastly, section 8 puts the entire thesis into perspective by discussing the usability of the study.

1.5 Delimitations

As mentioned in the introduction, AIESEC is an international organisation, and the thesis focuses on analysing and discussing knowledge creation and sharing on MyAIESEC.net amongst member countries and not within each member country. However, given the size of the organisation, it has not been possible to interview representatives from other member countries than Denmark, although this could have shown different knowledge behaviour patterns. Instead, respondents from different local committees in the organisation with different nationalities, ranks and functional areas have been chosen, to make the study reflect different types of knowledge behaviours. Fur-
thermore, it should be noted that interviews were carried out in English. Not being the mother tongue of any of the interviewees, this may have affected their ability to answer questions intuitively.

2. Theoretical background

Serving as a theoretical background, this section provides a definition of the traditional view of KM, which will be followed by a brief introduction to the concept of Web 2.0. The section will, however, begin with a description of knowledge including classification of knowledge types and knowledge paradigms.

2.1 Data, information and knowledge

Knowledge is often described as a pyramid comprising data, information and knowledge structured according to their actionable value and complexity. In this hierarchy, data is pure, raw facts that are external to the individual and has no intrinsic value of its own e.g. structured records. The data becomes information when “its creator adds meaning” by processing it, e.g. by putting the data into a context (Davenport & Prusak, 2000, p. 4). Finally, once the information becomes deeply embedded in the human mind, so that it aids decision-making and leads to actions, it has turned into valuable knowledge. Different from data and information, knowledge will be “anchored in the beliefs and commitments of individuals” (Nonaka et al., 2000, p. 7), thus also presuming that knowledge is relational i.e. it changes in the eyes of the beholder. How individuals act upon information will be related to their frame of reference based on past experiences acquired over time. The pyramid has been depicted in figure 2 below to provide an overview of the three related concepts.

![Figure 2 A Knowledge 'Hierarchy' (adapted from Newell et al., 2009)](image-url)
2.2 Explicit and tacit knowledge

Another important and widely used classification in KM research is the distinction between explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge (De Brún, 2005). Introduced in 1958 by Michael Polanyi, this distinction between knowledge types has helped shape the concept of KM and the supplementary theories into what it is today (De Brún, 2005). The term explicit knowledge connotes knowledge that has been articulated through words and numbers and shared in the form of documents (Nonaka, 1998). Being easy to articulate in a formal and systematic manner, this kind of knowledge can be processed, stored and transmitted between individuals relatively simply. In contrast, tacit knowledge is difficult to communicate and share with others due to its highly personal character. It consists of technical skills and “know-how” acquired and accumulated through the individual’s prior actions and experiences, as well as the ideals, values and perspectives an individual holds (Nonaka, 1998). Tacit knowledge is often such an ingrained part of human beings that it becomes difficult to share with others. A classic example is riding a bicycle – people know how to do it, but will have difficulties teaching others through written instructions.

2.3 Epistemology of possession and epistemology of practice

There are currently two major views on knowledge construction that stand out in the studies of organisational KM. These are generally referred to as the epistemology of possession regarding knowledge as something people have and the epistemology of practice regarding knowledge as something people do (Newell et al., 2009).

The epistemology of possession mainly adopts the traditional view upon knowledge, perceiving it as ‘justified true belief’, meaning that knowledge is essentially factual (Newell et al., 2009). However, unlike a Scientific Management approach, individuals are recognised as cognitive beings that interpret knowledge based on their subjective value systems. Knowledge is thus seen as context specific, but with the right means, it can be freed from its context to represent the ‘truth’. When knowledge is released from the personal beliefs of its owner, it becomes a mental object that can be transferred more or less freely between people (Nonaka, 1998).

The knowledge as possession view has, however, been criticised by proponents of the epistemology of practice (Wenger, 1998). Drawing from the scientific tradition of social constructivism, this perspective argues that knowledge cannot be regarded as the ‘truth’, as it will always be constructed in social interactions between people (Burr, 2001). Adhering to this point of view, knowledge is thus seen as embedded in the practices that people enact (what we say and what we do), and the practice of doing/saying can therefore not be separated from the practice of knowing.
Revisiting the example of learning how to ride a bicycle, the practice of riding the bike (tacit knowledge) cannot be separated from the knowledge about how to do it (explicit knowledge) as the two concepts are interwoven. Evidently, this also questions the sharp distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge presented in section 2.2, which much KM research builds upon. According to critics, explicit knowledge will always be rooted in tacit knowledge and should therefore not be seen as opposites, but instead as a continuum going from tacit in one end to explicit in the other, with most knowledge residing in between (Tsoukas, 1996). Therefore, in order to share knowledge for others to benefit, individuals must focus on sharing the practices and processes behind (Newell et al., 2009).

Each of these perspectives on the nature of knowledge builds two fundamentally different approaches to KM. Following a social constructivist approach, this thesis will concur with the epistemology of practice agreeing that knowledge arises out of the social relations between people. The traditional paradigm is however rooted in the epistemology of possession, which will be described briefly in the next section to provide the reader with an initial contextual frame.

### 2.2 Introduction to KM 1.0

According to Newell et al. (2009), much of the research written about KM has been built upon the epistemology of possession, and has therefore been centred around identifying, extracting and capturing knowledge of individuals to make it an available resource for the entire organisation to draw upon (Davenport & Prusak, 2000). A still widely quoted example emphasising this purpose was given by Davenport in 1994: "Knowledge management is the process of capturing, distributing, and effectively using knowledge" (as cited in Ghannay & Zaineb, 2012, p. 197). Another author, adhering to this point of view of KM, is Nonaka (1998). Focusing on knowledge as "justified true belief" (Nonaka et al., 2000, p. 7), he and his co-authors believe that "the central activity of the knowledge-creating company" is to "[make] personal knowledge available to others" (Nonaka, 1998, p. 26).

To fulfil this purpose, Knowledge Management Systems (KMS) have been specifically designed to store and transfer knowledge across the organisation. Their ability to facilitate instant knowledge sharing across distances makes them highly attractive for global companies seeking to improve knowledge communication between dispersed departments. Examples of some of the most popular KMS are e-mail, databases, and intranets.

Despite of their popularity, research indicates that users often find the technologies useless. In fact, a study of the use of KMS already made in 2000 reported failure rates of over 80% (Storey & Barnett, 2000). The ineffectiveness of KMS may be traced back to the knowledge per-
pective, which they are based on, namely the possession perspective, viewing knowledge as an object that can be codified and transferred freely across the organisation. New technological developments are however opening up opportunities for managing knowledge from a practice perspective.

2.3 Introduction to Web 2.0
The term Web 2.0 was first coined by Tim O’Reilly in 2005 and describes a new type of social software that puts more power into the hands of users than previous technologies (McAfee, 2006). Social networking sites, such as Facebook and YouTube, and other tools like wikis and blogs are empowering users of the Internet by enabling them to create content and share it directly with others. Web 2.0 technologies are democratising the Internet into a constantly updated collaborative platform that no longer restricts publishing, editing and filtering functionalities to IT experts (Pfaff & Hasan, 2011).

Recognising the significant changes Web 2.0 have induced in terms of how people use and approach the Internet, organisations have started to adopt the technologies for internal organisational purposes as well (Bebensee et al., 2012). Collaborative tools like Google Docs, Sharepoint and wikis enable groups to work jointly on a document in real time without having to be physically present. Probably, the most recognised example of a wiki is Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia created by the public.

According to McAfee, the common characteristic of these social technologies is their "focus not on capturing knowledge itself, but rather on the practices and output of knowledge workers." (2006, p. 23). Empowering users to add, delete, and amend content over time as well as to see the inputs of others, builds upon a practice orientation of knowledge. The technological developments open up opportunities for a new way of managing knowledge work from a practice perspective in the KM 2.0 paradigm.
3. Towards a KM 2.0 model

Building on the framework of Bougzhala & Limayem (2010), the main differences between the traditional paradigm and the emerging paradigm of KM will be analysed according to four key dimensions: knowledge, people, processes, and technology. Incorporating the perspectives of established researchers within the field (Newell et al., 2009; McAfee, 2009; Tredinnick, 2006), only the most fundamental differences affecting the holistic perspective of KM as a scientific discipline will be elicited (Table 1). An extended table with other important differences between KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 is enclosed in appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall focus</th>
<th>KM 1.0</th>
<th>KM 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge-oriented</td>
<td>People/practice oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Epistemology of possession</td>
<td>Epistemology of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual (expert) intelligence</td>
<td>Collective intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Users of knowledge</td>
<td>Co-creators of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channel networks</td>
<td>Community networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Transferring of “knowledge”</td>
<td>Sharing of practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal processes</td>
<td>Informal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down approach</td>
<td>Bottom-up approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>KMS</td>
<td>Web 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed structure</td>
<td>Emergent structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Comparison of traditional KM and KM 2.0 (adapted from Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010).

3.1 Knowledge

Before looking at each of the three key components, it is necessary to understand the shifting status of knowledge and information out of which KM 2.0 has emerged. As mentioned in section 2.2, the traditional paradigm has mainly approached knowledge from the possession perspective, and consequently, much of the KM literature has focused on capturing tacit knowledge or know-how of individuals to convert it into usable resources for the entire organisation to draw upon (Newell et al., 2009). One study, which much of the current KM literature has been build upon, is Nonaka’s SECI model\(^1\). Focusing on knowledge creation as a spiralling process of interactions between tacit

---
\(^1\) An explanation of the SECI model has been enclosed in appendix D.
and explicit knowledge, Nonaka (1998) describes how tacit knowledge can be converted into explicit knowledge through codification, so that others are able to access the same knowledge without having to go through the same experiences. From this perspective, tacit knowledge becomes an object, which can be separated from its creator to become accurately codified outside of its original context (Newell et al., 2009).

KM researchers following the epistemology of practice (Tredinnick, 2006; Wenger, 1998) criticise the framework of Nonaka and the like for failing to "take sufficient account of the more subjective, highly equivocal and dynamic nature of knowledge." (Newell et al., 2009, p. 12). Taking on a practice perspective instead, critics argue that KM should focus more upon managing and nurturing social relations between people to enable them to share practices, rather than managing knowledge itself as an objective entity that can be captured and codified (Newell et al., 2009).

3.2 People

The shift in knowledge perspective evidently changes how the aspect of people is viewed in terms of KM. According to Bougzhala & Limayem's (2010) framework, the dimension mainly focuses on how individuals interact with knowledge as well as the role of the individual's knowledge in the organisation. Based on this, three differences between KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 in terms of people were identified.

3.2.1 Individual vs. Collective intelligence

The first difference focuses on the role of the individual’s knowledge in the organisation. Within KM 1.0, the knowledge of individuals, most often experts and management, has had a more central role than knowledge originating from the entire organisation (Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010). This is evident in today's KMS: “Intranets today reflect one viewpoint – that of management – and are not platforms for dissent or debate.” (McAfee, 2006, p. 28). Recognising that knowledge creation is a dynamic process involving social interaction between different individuals, KM 2.0 focuses on nurturing collective intelligence instead (Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010). Organisations should thus focus on collaboration between individuals, as it is in the interaction and combination of different views that knowledge is created. With the shift in focus from individual intelligence to collective intelligence, each individual in the organisation plays a more central role, thereby also representing a more democratic structure in which everybody has a saying, not just top management or experts (Pfaff & Hasan, 2011).
3.2.2 Users of knowledge vs. Co-creators of knowledge

The second important difference identified is the central work mode of the individual when dealing with knowledge. As KM 1.0 perceives knowledge as an object that can be separated from its original creator, the perspective also brings about a distinction between creators of knowledge and end-users (Tredinnick, 2006). Most KMS mirror a "publishing model of information creation and dissemination" leaving individuals to be primarily "distanced from the (...) production process" (Tredinnick, 2006, p. 233). Individuals are therefore given the role of end-users of knowledge, which as mentioned, often is created by the few individuals holding expert status. In contrast, the paradigm of KM 2.0 focuses on individuals as co-creators of knowledge. Following the practice epistemology, knowledge will always be constructed in social interactions between people (Wenger, 1999), and organisations should therefore focus on providing tools that enable individuals to interact with each other and with knowledge to make them become part of the creation process (Newell et al., 2009). Thus in the new paradigm, individuals "play a more central role by consciously and unconsciously generating knowledge” instead of passively consuming it (Bougzala & Limayem, 2010 p. 1214)

3.2.3 Channel networks vs. Community networks

The final difference identified between the two paradigms in terms of people is the way individuals are tied together in a social network. According to Newell et al. (2009), there are two major types of social networks: networks as channels and networks as communities. Networks as channels mainly focus on providing virtual connectivity between individuals and the organisation to enable knowledge transfer across geographical areas. However, disagreeing with the proposition that knowledge is simply a cognitive entity that can be transferred between people with seemingly low relational proximity, KM 2.0 adopts a different approach to social networks by regarding them as communities, in which members need to have a shared identity based on common goals to be able to share knowledge and practices (Newell et al., 2009).

3.3 Processes

KM processes refer to "the activities or initiatives you put in place to enable and facilitate the creation, sharing and use of knowledge" (De Brún, 2005, p. 57). Thus, when organisations want to improve KM capabilities, they should focus on changing the internal processes embedded in their work. In terms of processes, three important differences were identified between KM 1.0 and KM 2.0.
3.3.1 Transferring of “knowledge” vs. Sharing of practices

As mentioned previously, an essential knowledge process in KM 1.0 is the transfer of captured knowledge, often tacit in nature, between dispersed individuals. A problem with this approach is however that “knowledge is treated as valuable in its own right, and is divorced from the social action and tasks that actually generate changes in performance.” (Newell et al., 2002, p. 143). The idea that knowledge can be readily transferred disregards differences between data, information and knowledge as described in section 2.1, while also ignoring the fact that much important knowledge is tacit in nature and cannot be readily codified. Taking this into consideration, KM 2.0 focuses on individuals sharing as well as learning new practices within community networks instead. Within communities, individuals are able to share experiences about their work with other members more naturally, as relationships are based on common grounds and mutual understanding (Wenger, 1998).

3.3.2 Formal processes vs. Informal processes

The second difference focuses on the nature of KM processes as being either formal or informal. KM 1.0 has focused on structured and formalised processes to ensure capturing of valuable knowledge through e.g. project review templates (Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010). The knowledge will typically be shared through formal communication channels based on established chains in the organisational charts. Within the new paradigm of KM, the primary source of value creation is informal processes, such as conversations and brainstorming, as they take the dynamic nature of knowledge into consideration (Wenger, 1998). Informal processes are engaged in voluntarily and are therefore not subject to predefined structures or routines, thereby making the process of knowledge sharing and creation more fluid (Newell et al., 2009).

3.3.3 Top-down communication vs. bottom-up communication

The third difference in terms of processes describes the change in knowledge flow direction. According to Bougzhala & Limayem (2010), “traditional KM is a Top-Down approach based on a corporate and normative strategy (centralization)” (p. 1214). Knowledge communication therefore often flows vertically with experts producing knowledge and top management approving it, before it is funnelled down organisational lines. In contrast, KM 2.0 approaches communication from a bottom-up perspective (Bougzhala & Limayem, 2010). Recognising that knowledge creation is an activity accomplished when individuals interact, the paradigm focuses more on nurturing collaborative processes that cut across functional and hierarchical boundaries. These traits are all characteristics of KM 2.0 and they have affected the design of new KM technologies, which we also know as Web 2.0 technologies (McAfee, 2009).
3.4 Technology

The fourth and final element of the comparative analysis is technology. As mentioned in section 2.3, new Web 2.0 tools for using the Internet are challenging traditional KMS by enabling functions for sharing of practices and processes. In the following, two important differences between Web 2.0 and KMS will be explained.

3.4.1 Control vs. Empowerment

The first difference identified between KMS and Web 2.0 is the level of control given to users of the systems. When reviewing traditional KMS, it is either management or IT support that controls most of them (Newell et al., 2002). As they select the knowledge they find relevant for improving organisational goals, KMS most often become tools for “filtering information down through the organization” such as best practices or guidelines (Tredinnick, 2006, p. 233). In contrast to the tightly controlled KMS, Web 2.0 technologies are structured and designed to “put more power into the hands of users to select, filter, publish, and edit information and participate in the creation of information resources.” (Tredinnick, 2006, p. 229). Instead of only having the role of users of knowledge, Web 2.0 tools also allow individuals to create content and share directly with peers in the organisation. Besides from decentralising authoring, tools such as wikis also enable “group editing”, allowing dispersed groups to collaborate on a document in real time (McAfee, 2009). Web 2.0 tools are thus designed to be more transparent and flexible to enable users to not only observe the output of knowledge production, but also the actual processes behind.

3.4.2 Imposed structure vs. Emergent structure

The second difference in terms of technology describes the shift in using KMS with imposed work structures towards Web 2.0 tools with emergent structures. According to McAfee (2009), most KMS have been designed according to the belief that “good outcomes in group-level work come from tightly structured processes” (p. 11). KMS have consequently been built with predefined structures, with only certain people and groups having the right to edit or add to it. The problem with this control is, according to McAfee (2009), that people are restricted in interacting and collaborating the same way they would in person. Imposing structures selected by few individuals thus stifles the dynamic nature of collaboration and knowledge creation. Realising this, Web 2.0 technologies refrain from predefined hierarchies and structures, and instead allow users to collectively organise content to let structure emerge, by incorporating functions of linking (linking between content) and tagging (electronic labelling of content with keywords describing the subject matter) (McAfee, 2009, p. 28). Through user tags and links to one another’s contributions, organi-
sation of information becomes a collaborative process reflecting a structure made by the entire organisation instead of few individuals overseeing the platform.

3.3 Sub-conclusion

In the previous section, the main differences between KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 were analysed according to four key dimensions; knowledge: people, processes and technology. On the basis of the analysis, eight parameters were extracted. As the purpose of the thesis is to create a holistic comparative analysis instead of focusing on certain aspects of KM, each parameter was not explained in-depth, but instead focused on the most prominent differences between the two paradigms.

Regarding people, the two paradigms differ by focusing on respectively capturing individual intelligence through codification and creating collective intelligence through collaboration. Furthermore, KM 1.0 distinguishes between users and creators of knowledge, with the main part being users, whereas KM 2.0 perceives every individual as co-creator, constantly creating and recreating new knowledge when interacting with existing knowledge. Lastly, the importance of strong social relations varies, with KM 1.0 focusing on loose connectivity, thus approaching social networks from a channel perspective, whereas KM 2.0 focuses on building strong social ties by approaching social networks from a community perspective.

Three differences were also identified in terms of processes. First of all, the main process of KM 1.0 is transferring of codified knowledge to other parts of the organisation, often done in a top-down manner. In contrast KM 2.0 focuses on sharing of processes and practices through mutual learning and collaboration, thereby focusing on knowledge communication flowing bottom-up. In addition, KM processes are mainly formal and structured in KM 1.0, whereas KM 2.0 focuses more on nurturing informal processes such as conversations and brainstorming.

In terms of technology, KMS such as intranets are the main technological tool used in KM 1.0, and most often it is either management or IT that controls them. New web 2.0 tools are however preferred in KM 2.0, as they empower users, thus also presenting a more democratic structure. The empowerment of users in KM 2.0 is meant to create an emergent structure of the platforms, opposed to KMS having predefined and imposed structures.

In conclusion, the findings of the analysis exemplify how the practice perspective of knowledge transforms the KM elements of people, processes and technology into a new conception of KM that focuses more on social relations and interaction between people than capturing knowledge itself.
4. Methodology

To answer part two of the problem statement, a qualitative case study was chosen as the preferred research method. As the purpose is to analyse how key members of AIESEC share knowledge, the qualitative method was deemed to be most suitable, because it provides the researcher close involvement with the subject of investigation (Schrøder, 2001).

4.1 Case Study

By using multiple data collection techniques, the validity and reliability of case study evidence can be strengthened (Yin, 2003). Thus, the paper sought to combine interviews of AIESEC members with direct observations of the organisation's intranet to reach a holistic understanding of the KM processes currently occurring on a global level.

First of all, semi-structured in-depth interviews of five members in AIESEC were carried out to capture the complex nature of knowledge sharing within the organisation. Interviews are according to Yin (2003) “one of the most important sources of case study information” (p. 89), as it allows the researcher to obtain a holistic and detailed view of the subject of investigation by digging deep into the reasoning of the interviewee. The interviews were conducted according to an interview guide (appendix E) based on themes derived from research theory on KM (Andersen, 2008). As the case study also focuses on how MyAIESEC.net facilitates KM processes, direct observations of the intranet at work were made to understand how it is being used and what potential problems are being encountered (Yin, 2003). Access to the intranet was gained by becoming an actual member of AIESEC for 5 months.

By combining interviews with direct observations, the case study is grounded in multiple sources of evidence, thus enhancing the accurateness of the findings (Yin, 2003). The interviews along with the direct observations functioned as the primary source of evidence in the case study.

4.2 Interview guide

As mentioned earlier, semi-structured interviews were carried out using an interview guideline (Andersen, 2008) that was based on the literature review of KM to uncover KM processes occurring within AIESEC. To illuminate differences in knowledge sharing depending on their organisational rank, five interviews were conducted with two members from National Committee in Denmark and three members from two different Local Committees in Denmark. The members also represent different functional areas being Talent Management, Communication, Information Management and Outgoing Exchange to capture different perspectives of the knowledge sharing pro-
cedures occurring in AIESEC. The interviews lasted for around an hour on average, and recordings have been enclosed as audio files on a CD.

The question formulation and the order they were in were not followed slavishly, but instead respondents were allowed to control the structure of the interview to a certain extent. The point of orientation often changed due to the unpredictable and interactive nature of the interview, thereby allowing interviewees to respond intuitively. The open-ended questions enabled an insight into the knowledge sharing practices of the respondents, which were then used to draw generalising conclusions on the actual KM behaviours of AIESEC. The questions in the interview guide were divided into four broad topics: knowledge-sharing processes, knowledge gathering processes, use of the intranet for knowledge creation, and motivational reasons for using the intranet. The complete interview guide with interview questions and theoretical motivation for their inclusion has been enclosed in appendix E.
5. Case study: Knowledge management in AIESEC

Focusing on the second part of the problem statement, this section contains a case study analysis of the global student organisation AIESEC. To begin with, the section presents a short company profile, based partly on information from the organisation’s website and annual reports, and partly on interview outcomes. This is followed by the analysis of MyAIESEC.net and the knowledge sharing behaviours in AIESEC. The findings of the comparative analysis in section 3 constitute the theoretical foundation of the analysis, which combined with the conducted interviews and the intranet observations, are used for determining the extent to which the intranet follows KM 1.0, and what implications this might have on AIESEC’s overall KM efforts.

5.1 Company profile

AIESEC is an international non-profit organisation that provides students with leadership development training and global internship opportunities. With more than 86,000 members scattered in 113 countries, AIESEC is the world’s largest student-run organisation. One of the core businesses of AIESEC is to raise internships through its powerful network, and facilitate these to students interested in working abroad. Through the organisation’s global internship program, AIESEC matches companies with students interested in personal and academic growth.

As seen in figure 3, AIESEC’s organisational structure is hierarchically ordered in three levels. Each department, whether it is international, national or local level, consists of a membership board elected at the beginning of a one-year term. With the departure of the old board, important knowledge disappears, and this presents many challenges in terms of knowledge sharing and creation in the organisation. As Respondent C expresses about knowledge sharing:

“[it] is very crucial in order to retain knowledge about what has happened, what has worked, what didn’t work, considering the strategies, activities and processes. Because, after one year, people change (red. management is replaced). So, it’s very important that information stays, so we don’t have to reinvent the wheel every year.” (Audio file 3, 1:38)
5.2 Analysing MyAIESEC.net

To respond to the challenges, the organisation decided to build an intranet facilitating internal communication amongst the global members of AIESEC. The web-based platform was launched in 2007 under the name MyAIESEC.net. In the following, it will be analysed to which extent the technical principles employed, the processes enabled and the relations created between people adhere to the paradigm of KM 1.0 or KM 2.0.

5.2.1 Technology

MyAIESEC.net has Web 2.0 technology integrated in its system, thus separating it from traditional KMS. First of all, it has an in-built wiki module in which every user can create wiki pages and secondly, it is built with an emergent structure. Taking these functionalities into consideration, MyAIESEC.net appears to be a KM 2.0 platform. Whether it also adheres to a KM 2.0 strategy will be examined in the following.

The first dimension in the analysis is “Control vs. Empowerment”, and entails the level of control given to users of the system. As with most Web 2.0 tools, MyAIESEC.net decentralises au-
Authoring by allowing everybody to create content e.g. upload documents, create wikis and start conversations. However, in contrast to the philosophy of KM 2.0, editing rights are limited to the members that are of higher rank than the creator of the content (Respondent B, Audio file 2, 33:21). E.g. national level can edit local level wikis, but local level cannot edit wikis created by national level. The wikis created by AIESEC International are, however, restricted from being edited by anyone below their level. Thus, within MyAIESEC.net, collective editing rights have been disabled, even though this is in fact one of the fundamental functions of wikis (Mader, 2008). In line with traditional KMS, the platform instead functions as an information database, where members can retrieve knowledge contributed by others. This was commented on in a statement by Respondent B, who has editing rights of local committee content in force of his position on the national team: “I think that there are possibilities of being able to edit a Wiki, but usually the majority only creates a Wiki to put something out there” (Audio file 2, 33:26). The design of editing rights cedes some of the control of the platform to AIESEC International, and thereby also disempowers lower level members to a certain extent. Hence, in terms of this dimension of technology, MyAIESEC.net is designed according to both strategies, where members have authoring rights but not group editing rights.

The second dimension of technology involves the type of structure the technology is built upon, either “Imposed structure vs. Emergent structure”. Aligned with KM 2.0 tools, MyAIESEC.net is built without any imposing structures, such as predefined hierarchies or categorisation systems developed and overseen by an authority. Instead, categorisation of content is meant to emerge freely through a folksonomy, thereby making categorisation a collaborative process (McAfee, 2009). However, mechanisms, such as tagging and linking to create a folksonomy, have not been implemented on the platform. Instead, content is filtered according to title given by the contributor: “If you are searching for a wiki that has something to do with recruitment but is not named recruitment then it can be very hard to find” (Respondent E, Audio file 5, 20:08). This consequently inhibits a structure from emerging, thereby making the search process more difficult:

“the biggest challenge is that the search engine is so bad (...) You don’t have the possibility to specify (...) so it always gets either too specific and you get nothing or too broad and you get everything, and not the relevant stuff.” (Respondent A, Audio file 1, 17:16)

Although MyAIESEC.net builds upon an emergent structure, in compliance with the paradigm of KM 2.0, categorisation of content is still an individual process, reflecting a KM 1.0 mind-set.
5.2.2 Processes

As evident from the findings presented in the previous section, the technological design of My-AIESEC.net constrains some of the fundamental advantages of Web 2.0 functionalities by obstructing functions of decentralised editing and collective categorisation of content. Instead, AIESEC has applied different technological functions that enable certain other KM processes, which the organisation wants to support. In the following the most dominant processes will be examined.

When studying the dimension "Transferring of "knowledge" vs. Sharing of Practices", it is necessary to examine how knowledge is shared in the organisation. According to Respondent D, MyAIESEC.net is a platform for uploading documents and creating wikis (Audio file, 8:09). Often, the documents shared only focus on project outcome and exclude processes behind the project: "When we have a project going on you don't (...) always write the details from the very beginning to the end. You usually just write the hardcore facts you need to put in right here and right now" (Respondent E, Audio file 5, 6:09). This indicates, that what is often being shared by members is in fact not knowledge, but simple data, relating back to the distinction between data, information and knowledge in section 2.1. Furthermore, as there are no possibilities of providing feedback or asking questions, the intranet is also perceived as a "one-way communication tool" (Audio file 5, 40:43), in which information is "not always so transparent" (Respondent C, Audio file 3, 9:58). Given these observations, it can be concluded that MyAIESEC.net mainly functions as a forum for sharing information through document exchange and not sharing of practices, thus adhering to a KM 1.0 perspective.

In terms of "Formal processes vs. Informal processes", MyAIESEC.net mainly enables structured, formal processes of knowledge sharing through document exchange, but also incorporates few informal process elements such as conversation and Q&A forums. These are, however, used "to say something to other entities (...) usually adverts for conferences or adverts for member committee positions" (Respondent B, Audio file 2, 35:17) and not for sharing experiences or ideas. Respondent D does, however, make note of a messaging system, but as he explains: it "is more like really badly made email inboxes. If they had a chat function, that would be so much easier." (Audio file 4, 41:25). Thus, when engaging in informal processes, other platforms such as Facebook are used:

"We use [Facebook] as an online brainstorm tool, where if we have ideas we want to do in our local committees, we share them there and get inputs and so on." (Respondent D, Audio file 4, 9:42)
Respondent C provided another example, explaining that when she shared inputs from AIESEC’s recently held national conference, she informally shared the main points through Facebook but uploaded a formal report on MyAIESEC.net (Audio file 3, 14:07). From these observations it can be concluded that members mainly use the intranet for formal knowledge sharing processes, but when engaging in informal processes localised substitutes, such as Facebook, are used.

“Top-down communication vs. bottom-up communication” is another perspective of processes, focusing on how knowledge flows on MyAIESEC.net. According to Respondent D, the majority of wikis consists of ‘good case practices’ created by Local Committee members. Some wikis also contain knowledge about ‘best practices’, which AIESEC International mainly produces (Audio file 4, 44:30). These wikis have the purpose of aligning members’ efforts with the global strategy of AIESEC: “in here, they will put all the information that a local vice president would need (...) e.g. in order to do a successful recruitment” thereby ensuring that members are “sticking within the international alignment of how to do it.” (Respondent E, Audio file 5, 24:20). Knowledge therefore flows both ways; ‘good case practices’ flow from local level and upwards, whereas ‘best practices’ flow from international level and downwards. Wikis produced by higher-level members are however the only ones being promoted, thus also gaining more exposure: “now that I am on the national board, I have much more possibility to make, like important wikis, that people need to look at, that are then being promoted.” (Audio file 3, 31:08). This indicates, that even though knowledge flows in both directions, the focus is mainly on distributing information top-down, which complies with the main paradigm of KM 1.0.

5.2.3 People

In the previous section, KM processes of AIESEC were explored, and the findings showed predominant traits of the traditional paradigm, including sharing of information in a structured and formalised fashion often communicated in a top-down manner. The members’ view upon knowledge evidently affect the knowledge processes that AIESEC engages in, and therefore this section will focus on the people of AIESEC, and how they relate to knowledge and to each other.

In terms of “Individual vs. Collective intelligence”, it is necessary to examine whether the focus is on nurturing the knowledge of individuals or the knowledge of the collective. According to Respondent A, AIESEC tries to adhere to the principle “sharing is caring”, but often members refrain from sharing because of lack of confidence (Audio file 1, 8:27). Respondent E elaborates, by stating her reason for not contributing: “I don’t feel like I’ve done anything that exceeds the knowledge that is already on MyAIESEC.net (...) I don’t feel like I’ve come up with something (...) that is not already there” “(Audio file 5, 41:49). Given their position in the hierarchy, lower-level members feel that their contributions are of less value to others: “I just don’t feel like I have the au-
For me the authority lies with national team (...)” (Respondent A, Audio file 1, 21:20). This indicates that AIESEC throughout time probably has highlighted the importance of expert knowledge (national and international level) more than the knowledge originating from every member in the organisation. On the basis of this, it can be concluded that the focus of AIESEC is mainly on nurturing individual intelligence, which is a dominant characteristic of KM 1.0

Studying the dimension “Users of knowledge vs. Co-creators of knowledge” entails examining the central work mode of the individual. As evident from the analysis of technology and processes, MyAIESEC.net clearly distinguishes creators of knowledge from end-users by omitting possibilities of dialoguing and inhibiting decentralised editing of wikis. The majority of members thus becomes passive users of content: “some people upload something that you can read and benefit from, but you don’t really ask questions or say thank you or anything like that.” (Respondent E, Audio file 5, 40:43). Only taking on a passive role as users of knowledge, members simply follow directives of AIESEC International or National Committee as “old recipes” (Newell et al., 2002, p. 104), thus failing to view the processes from a critical perspective: “I trust the wikis blindly, I never doubt anything or critical about it and that may be my fault but that’s because of my perception of it.” (Respondent A, Audio file 1, 22:07). As the platform does not bring knowledge up for discussion, but merely functions as a distributing channel, the knowledge inherent risks becoming stagnant (McAfee, 2009).

“Channel networks vs. Community networks” is the last dimension in the analysis and focuses on the way members relate to each other when conducting knowledge work. MyAIESEC.net is mainly used for providing loose connectivity between members, thus functioning as a global channel network for knowledge transfer (Newell et al., 2009). The platform has a contact database of members with background and contact information such as email, but does not facilitate communication itself (Respondent D, Audio file 4, 28:33). Only being connected by a database of information, the platform offers low relational proximity between members, thereby making it difficult to learn from each other and share processes and practices (Wenger, 1998). In fact, Respondent D deemed the lack of shared “realities” and common grounds as the biggest challenge in terms of sharing knowledge on MyAIESEC.net, at times resulting in ineffective adoption of ‘good case practices’ shared by other member countries (Audio file 4, 13:08).
5.3 Sub-conclusion

The preceding analysis had the purpose of examining to which extent MyAIESEC.net adheres to the paradigm of KM 1.0 or KM 2.0. Regarding technology, the intranet differentiates from traditional KMS by integrating Web 2.0 functionalities such as an in-built wiki module and an emergent structure. MyAIESEC.net therefore appears to be a KM 2.0 platform, but the analysis revealed that it is in fact semi-controlled; though providing authoring rights, collective editing rights have been disabled. Furthermore, the platform is built with a structure that is meant to emerge, but as functions for creating a folksonomy have been omitted, the structure has instead become chaotic, making the search on MyAIESEC.net troublesome. Thus, in terms of technology, the platform mainly adheres to KM 2.0, but the mentioned restrictions decrease the democratic nature of the platform, giving it traits of a traditional KM 1.0 platform as well.

The analysis of KM processes also revealed characteristics of both paradigms. Functioning as a knowledge repository, the main process engaged in on MyAIESEC.net is exchange of explicit knowledge, but without any possibilities of interacting with the contributor, the process subsides into transferring of data and information. Though having Q&A and conversation forums, processes are purely formal and structured. Furthermore, knowledge flows in both directions; bottom-up in the form of ‘good case practices’ and top-down in the form of best practices. However, as the analysis revealed, only top-down communication is being promoted through other channels.

Out of the three dimensions examined, people adheres to KM 1.0 mostly. The fact that some members feel that their contributions are of less value to others revealed a strong focus on individual intelligence. As MyAIESEC.net only provides publishing functions, a clear distinction between users and creators are present, with the majority mainly taking on the role as passive users of ‘best practice’ knowledge, by uncritically following directives. Furthermore, the low relational proximity between members indicates that the platform is a forum for establishing loose connections, not relations. The lack of common ground between members makes sharing of knowledge difficult, resulting in ineffective ‘good case practice’ adoptions.

As apparent from the analysis, MyAIESEC.net and the processes and relations it facilitates mainly follows the paradigm of KM 1.0, even though it incorporates Web 2.0 functionalities. The aim of the platform is still to capture codified knowledge through formal processes and share it through the organisation, thereby making knowledge, the centre of attention and not the social relations between people as in KM 2.0. This also indicates that AIESEC’s KM efforts originate out of an epistemology of possession, in which knowledge is seen as an intangible object that evolves in the minds’ of individuals and not through social relations. The findings of the analysis are summarised in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KM 1.0</th>
<th>KM 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall focus</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge-oriented</td>
<td>People/practice oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Epistemology of possession</td>
<td>Epistemology of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>Individual (expert) intelligence</td>
<td>Collective intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Users of knowledge</td>
<td>Co-creators of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channel networks</td>
<td>Community networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Transferring of “knowledge”</td>
<td>Sharing of practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal processes</td>
<td>Informal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down approach</td>
<td>Bottom-up approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>KMS</td>
<td>Web 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed structure</td>
<td>Emergent structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Case study analysis summarised
6. Improving MyAIESEC.net according to KM 2.0

As mentioned in section 3.3, the underlying assumption of KM 2.0 stems from the epistemology of practice, regarding knowledge as embedded in the practices of knowledge work. The overall focus of KM 2.0 is therefore to nurture social relations between people, so that they are able to share practices, instead of information. By adhering to KM 2.0, this section will discuss how AIESEC can tackle the main issues identified in section 5.

First of all, to overcome reluctance to share, members of AIESEC need to focus on knowledge creation as "the outcome of bringing different types of knowledge together", instead of seeing it as an individual process (Newell et al., 2009, p. 79). To create this collective intelligence, the contributions, opinions and ideas of every member, from lower level to upper level of the organisation, should be valued as important resources that bring in diverse perspectives in the creation process. By emphasising that everyone has a responsibility for creating knowledge, members will be more inclined to share ideas and experiences. In time, AIESEC can strive to build an organisational culture of sharing based on mutual reciprocity and bottom-up communication (Wenger, 1998).

Acknowledging the importance of all members’ contributions also entails empowering them to voice their opinions, and be critical towards current practices to avoid MyAIESEC.net and the knowledge it retains from becoming stagnant. Practices can only be innovated, if members are regarded as co-creators of knowledge capable of contributing with added value to ‘best practice’ wikis created by international level, instead of being perceived as passive end-users following ‘how-to-guides’. By enabling the majority of members to take active part in the creation of knowledge, wikis about 'best practices' can become a representation of how the entire organisation will improve efficiency, and not just management level (McAfee, 2009).

The low relational proximity between global members is another reason why the creation of a common set of practices has failed. To be able to learn from practices of others, social ties between members need to be stronger and based on common ground to avoid miscommunication. Normally, strong relations are created face-to-face, but as global members only interact through MyAIESEC.net, the platform must facilitate informal processes of virtual dialoguing and conversing that resemble how individuals would interact in real life. Frequent, informal interaction amongst members from different nations and levels of the hierarchy can thereby aid in the creation of a shared practice around which a virtual community can emerge (Wenger, 1998).

Consequently, MyAIESEC.net needs to be redesigned to resemble a more democratic structure, in which members are empowered to interact with the existing knowledge on the plat-
form, but also with each other. The platform should open up possibilities for informal conversing by implementing chat functions. It should also enable collaborative knowledge creation processes, by having wikis for general knowledge that can be edited by everyone. By empowering members to add, delete and amend content over time as well as to see the inputs of others, members are enabled to not only share the outputs of knowledge work through documents, but also make the processes of how it was produced visible (i.e. the actual practices) (Newell et al., 2009). Furthermore, to improve the search function, mechanisms for collective organisation of content, such as tagging and linking between contributions, should be implemented to make the failed structure of My-AIESEC.net emerge. Incorporating these functions will turn the platform into a reflection of how the entire organisation actually carries out knowledge work, and not a representation of how management wants knowledge work to be done (Tredinnick, 2006).
7. Conclusion

From a social constructivist viewpoint, this thesis presented how the shift from a possession perspective of knowledge to a practice perspective creates a new paradigm of KM, KM 2.0, incorporating democratic Web 2.0 technologies. Building upon the framework of Bougzhala & Limayem (2010), a comparative analysis of KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 was conducted and subsequently eight parameters were extracted to explain the main differences between the two paradigms. In conclusion, the findings exemplified how the practice perspective of knowledge transforms the three main elements of KM: people, processes, and technology into a new conception that focuses more on relations between people and their practices, than the process of capturing knowledge itself.

To provide an empirical example of the framework, the thesis also presented a case study of the global student organisation AIESEC, assessing the extent to which its intranet MyAIESEC.net follows the paradigm of KM 1.0. The methodological approach used was qualitative interviews of members from different functional areas and hierarchical levels combined with intranet observations. Findings of the study revealed that even though the intranet incorporates Web 2.0 functionalities, MyAIESEC.net predominantly adheres to KM 1.0. This was especially evident in the dimension people. As a result of following this perspective of KM, four issues were identified in terms of sharing and creating knowledge: reluctance to share on MyAIESEC.net caused by a focus on collective intelligence, uncritical consumption of ‘best practice’ content ultimately leading to a stagnant platform, lack of common grounds between members making it difficult to share practices and an ineffective search function caused by a structure that failed to emerge. The problems identified were addressed from a KM 2.0 perspective with recommendations of focusing on collective intelligence and thus also acknowledging every member as co-creators of knowledge instead of end-users. Furthermore, common grounds between members should be established by cultivating MyAIESEC.net into a community network, in which members are enabled to share practices and processes behind their knowledge work. Last, tagging and linking functions should be incorporated to let structure emerge through collective organisation of content.

In conclusion, the thesis has shown how incorporating elements of KM 2.0 can improve AIESEC’s KM strategy. Findings of the study are however socially constructed from the viewpoint of the author, and are therefore not universally applicable, but can be used as inspiration for other organisations or theoreticians to build upon in the future.
8. Perspective
Throughout the different sections of the thesis, a very clear distinction between two different ways of managing knowledge has been made. KM 1.0 is presented as a rigid and structured approach, whereas KM 2.0 is presented as being more fluent and unrestricted. However, it is important to recognise that the two paradigms should not be seen as mutually exclusive; the emergence of KM 2.0 does not entail complete abandonment of KM 1.0, but simply builds upon the original paradigm. For the sake of the understanding of the thesis, the paradigms have been sharply contrasted, but most organisations are in fact in need of both approaches to varying extents. Depending on the type of knowledge work, some organisations rely more on explicit and codified knowledge than others. E.g. law firms need to present information in its most factual manner and store it in a database for others to use when similar cases arise (McAfee, 2009). Furthermore, some of the work processes in a company can be considered as standard processes, and in these cases, following codified, 'best practice' workflows might be most efficient. However, recognising that “around 80% of an organisation’s knowledge is tacit” (De Brün, 2005, p. 24), and thus near impossible to articulate, the need for a KM 2.0 approach, that focuses less on managing explicit knowledge, and more on creating conditions that enable individuals to share tacit knowledge, is indeed present. The findings presented in this thesis can thus be used by organisations as inspiration on how to incorporate more KM 2.0 features into their already established KM strategies.
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Figure 2 A Knowledge 'Hierarchy' (adapted from Newell et al., 2009)
Appendix C: Extended table of KM 1.0 and KM 2.0 differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KM 1.0</th>
<th>KM 2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall focus</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge-oriented</td>
<td>People/practice oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>Epistemology of possession</td>
<td>Epistemology of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product knowledge</td>
<td>Process knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>Individual intelligence</td>
<td>Collective intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User</td>
<td>Co-creators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channel networks</td>
<td>Community networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert knowledge</td>
<td>Individual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>Transferring of “knowledge”</td>
<td>Sharing of practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal processes</td>
<td>Informal processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down approach</td>
<td>Bottom-up approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More structured</td>
<td>Less structured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less transparent</td>
<td>More transparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>Decentralization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>KMS</td>
<td>Web 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed structure</td>
<td>Emergent structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rigid tools</td>
<td>Flexible tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passive with a static content</td>
<td>Participatory and customizable with dynamic content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generated by professionals</td>
<td>Generated by users themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated technologies for KM</td>
<td>Collaborative IT features that can be embedded in other technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Adapted from Bougzhala & Limayem (2010) pp. 1216
Appendix D: Nonaka’s SECI model

A lot of research has been done on the processes of knowledge-creation in organisations. Nonaka & Konno emphasised that knowledge is created through interactions between explicit and tacit knowledge and based on this perception, the two researchers created the widely recognised SECI model of knowledge-creation in 1998. According to the authors of the model, there are four modes within a knowledge creation process being socialisation (acquiring new tacit knowledge e.g. when discussing ideas with peers), externalisation (codifying/writing about new knowledge to make it explicit), combination (recombining different types of explicit knowledge e.g. when collaborating between departments) and internalisation (applying and embedding explicit knowledge internally so that it becomes background knowledge). In the following each of the four conversion processes will be explained in depth.

Socialisation
Within the socialisation mode, tacit knowledge is shared between individuals through a socialisation process. Nonaka and Konno (1998) argue that tacit knowledge only can be exchanged through shared experiences and joint activities, e.g. an employee can acquire important tacit knowledge by having direct interaction with co-workers or customers. By observing, imitating and practicing the work of others, either within or outside the organisation, employees can gather tacit skills and incorporate them as part of their own tacit knowledge base (Nonaka, 1998).

Externalisation
Externalisation is the process of converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge by codifying knowledge into a sharable format (Nonaka, 1998). When tacit knowledge is made explicit it crystallises and becomes the basis of new knowledge for others to exploit. Organisations can encourage the externalisation process by providing employees with tools and techniques for expressing tacit ideas through words, concepts and figurative language such as metaphors, storytelling, analogies or narratives (Nonaka & Konno, 1998).

Combination
The combination mode is the process of combining explicit knowledge and converting it into more complex explicit knowledge (Nonaka & Konno, 1998). To convert explicit knowledge in the combination process, three critical phases must be accomplished. First, explicit knowledge is obtained from either inside or outside the organisation, next, the explicit knowledge is made accessible by disseminating it to other employees, and last, the explicit knowledge is edited or processed into new explicit knowledge, e.g. in the form of reports, project plans or market data that can be utilised into practical action steps (Nonaka, 1998).

Internalisation
The process of internalisation refers to the conversion of explicit knowledge into tacit knowledge. By sharing newly created explicit knowledge within the organisation employees can process and reflect upon it through e.g. training and exercises. Once the knowledge has been internalised it enriches their tacit knowledge base. According to Nonaka and Konno (1998), explicit knowledge cannot be embodied unless it is actualised through action and practice. Therefore, to foster the internalisation process, organisations should encourage a ‘learning by doing’ approach by providing training programmes to its employees. Once the tacit knowledge has become part of the individuals’ tacit knowledge base, it can start a new spiral of knowledge creation when being shared with others through the socialisation process (Nonaka et al., 2000).
Appendix E: Interview guide

The first questions are aimed at defining the respondents' knowledge sharing behaviours with other members of AIESEC. Questions related to the frequency and manner in which knowledge is being shared has therefore been selected. Furthermore, questions about the challenges and advantages of sharing knowledge will be asked to clarify the respondents’ general attitude towards knowledge sharing. The type of knowledge most often shared by the respondents is also relevant to uncover, thus questions concerning how the respondent makes other members acquainted with their knowledge are chosen to explain whether it is mainly through the exchange of documents, emails or through face-to-face conversations.

1. How long have you been a member of AIESEC?
2. What are your main tasks as a member?
3. How often do you experience that you have knowledge others would benefit from?
4. What do you think is the most important information that needs to be shared?
5. How do you share the knowledge and experiences gained from a finished project to make sure others can benefit from it? (E.g. documents, face-to-face interaction)
6. Who do you share your knowledge with?
7. Which advantages and disadvantages do you consider when sharing your knowledge? Examples of good and bad situations (E.g. immediate usefulness to others, too time-consuming a process)
8. What is the biggest challenge when sharing knowledge with others in AIESEC?

The following questions deal with how the respondent gathers knowledge from other members. The respondent might have different perceptions and behaviours of knowledge sharing when it involves obtaining knowledge as opposed to conveying it, and the second section of questions therefore seeks to uncover how the respondent views the process of knowledge creation from the perspective of receiving it. Questions about the respondent's attitude towards the usefulness of other members' experiences as well as their methods for searching knowledge are both prominent themes within this part of the interview guide.

9. To which extent can you use the experiences that others have made?
10. When dealing with a certain task or project, how do you gather knowledge to solve it?
11. Do you ever contact members through the intranet to gain knowledge for a project? If yes, do you feel that your questions are welcomed? Are they open, friendly, dismissive?
12. Do you sometimes seek knowledge for a project outside of the organisation even though you know it exists within the organisation? (E.g. searching the web). Why?
13. When searching for knowledge within the organisation, how do you go about it?
14. What is the biggest challenge when retrieving knowledge from other members?

Moving from questions about knowledge sharing and creation in general to the specific use of the intranet as a knowledge-sharing platform, the third part of the interview guide focuses on how much time the respondents spend on the intranet and how they go about it. This part also seeks to clarify the respondent's attitude towards the intranet as a knowledge creation platform and whether or not they deem it useful for their everyday work.

15. How often do you search for information and knowledge on the intranet?
16. What is your experience with the intranet? Have you had any good or bad experiences?
17. What are the major challenges of using the intranet?
18. What are the major benefits of using the intranet?
19. To which extent do you feel that the intranet is beneficial for your work and other members’ work?
20. Who uses the intranet for retrieving knowledge?
21. Who uploads documents to the intranet?

The last part of the interview guide has the purpose of understanding the factors that cultivate positive knowledge behaviour on the intranet. Thus, questions about what stimulates and motivates the respondent to create, share or draw on a piece of knowledge on the intranet in their work routines will be asked. Furthermore, the questions revolve around the amount of managerial support given to members of AIESEC to use the intranet for knowledge sharing. When striving to foster a knowledge-creating environment it is important to have an open organisational culture that values collaboration among colleagues instead of competition (McAfee, 2006). The amount of control that respondents have for contributing, editing and structuring the intranet to fit their individual work processes is an important factor for successful knowledge creation and questions concerning this theme have therefore been incorporated as well.

22. Are there guidelines stating how to use the intranet? E.g. what should be uploaded on the intranet and which information should be shared?
23. Are you sometimes encouraged or discouraged by management to use the intranet?
24. Do you feel that you have many possibilities for contributing and editing content on the intranet?
25. Do you like the structure of the intranet?
26. Are you currently motivated to search on the intranet and contribute with your own ideas?
27. What would motivate you to contribute to the intranet?
28. How successful is the knowledge sharing processes in the organisation according to you?
Appendix F: Table 3 AIESEC Organisational chart

The organisation has local, national and international offices across the globe, run by students or recent graduates from over 2,400 universities. Viewing it from a broad perspective, AIESEC’s organisational structure is hierarchically ordered in three levels as can be seen in the organisational chart (Figure 2). The flow of communication between the different committees is mainly characterised as top-down with information flowing from AIESEC International down to Member Committees and Local Committees. Based in Holland, AIESEC International oversees global directions and exchange strategies for the entire organisation. Each member country has a national executive board called the Member Committee, which is in charge of coordinating the work of the Local Committees and call for national actions. Following the strategies created by Member Committees, Local Committees can be perceived as the operational units of AIESEC, executing strategies through local projects. Within each Local Committee, there is a president and several functional vice presidents in charge of areas such as Talent Management (TM), External Relations (ER), Finance (F), Communication (Com), Exchange (X) and Student Relations (SR). Depending on the size of the Local Committee, each functional vice president will oversee a number of members to perform various tasks in the accomplishment of local goals aligned with national and consequently also international goals.