(H: Hypothesis, P: Proposition, S: Testable Statement, RQ: Research Question)

Analysis of Axiomatic Theory Elements (ATE)				
Paper	Non-		АТЕ Туре	9
Hypotheses	ATE	I	II	III
Agarwal, R., and Karahanna, E. 2000. "Time Flies When You're Having Beliefs About Information Technology Usage," MIS Quarterly (24:4), p			bsorptio	n and
H1: Perceived usefulness of an information technology has a positive effect on behavioral intention to use the information technology.		✓	✓	✓
H2: Perceived ease of use of an information technology has a positive effect on behavioral intention to use the information technology.		✓	✓	✓
H3: Perceived ease of use of an information technology has a positive effect on the perceived usefulness of the information technology.	✓			
H4: After controlling for self-efficacy perceptions, cognitive absorption with an information technology has a positive effect on the perceived		✓	<b>√</b>	✓
ease of use of the information technology.  H5: After controlling for self-efficacy perceptions, cognitive absorption with an information technology has a positive effect on the perceived		<b>√</b>	✓	✓
usefulness of the information technology.  H6: Computer playfulness has a positive effect on cognitive absorption				
with an information technology.  H7: Personal innovativeness has a positive effect on cognitive		√	✓	<b>√</b>
absorption with an information technology.		<b>√</b>	√	√
Ahuja, M. K., and Thatcher, J. B. 2005. "Moving Beyond Intentions an Effects of Work Environment and Gender on Post-Adoption Informati				ıng:
Quarterly (29:3), pp. 427-459.		1		
H1a: Quantitative overload negatively influences trying to innovate with IT.		✓		
H1b: Qualitative overload negatively influences trying to innovate with IT.		✓		
H2: Perceived autonomy positively influences trying to innovate with IT.	√			
H3: The relationship between autonomy and the trying to innovate with IT will be stronger in men than in women.	✓			✓
H4: The relationship between overload and trying to innovate with IT will be stronger in women than in men.	✓			
H5a: Autonomy interacts with quantitative overload to positively	<b>√</b>			
influence individual's trying to innovate with IT.  H5b: The above interaction effect will be stronger in women than in	<b>√</b>			
men.  H6a: Autonomy interacts with qualitative over load to positively influence	✓			
individual's trying to innovate with IT.  H6b: The above interaction effect will be stronger in women than in	· ✓			
men.			A 04	
Ang, S., and Straub, D. 1998. "Production and Transaction Economie the U.S. Banking Industry," MIS Quarterly (22:4), pp. 535-552.	s and 15 O	utsourci	ng: A Sti	lay of
H1: The higher the comparative production cost advantage offered through IT outsourcing, the greater is the degree of IT outsourcing.		✓		
H2: The less the transaction costs involved in hiring outsourcers, the greater is the degree of IT outsourcing.		✓		
H3: The less the financial slack, the greater the degree of IT	✓			
outsourcing.  NOTE: Firm (bank) size is also tested, but not hypothesized.				
Arnold, V., Clark, N., Collier, P. A., Leech, S. A., & Sutton, S. G. 2006.	"The Diffe	rential U	se and E	ffect of
Knowledge-Based System Explanations in Novice and Expert Judgm (30:1), pp. 79-97.	ent Systen	ns," <i>MIS</i>	Quarterl	y,
H1: KBS users will be more likely to adhere to the recommendation of a KBS		<b>√</b>		
when explanations are provided.				
H2: When using a KBS with explanation facilities, novices will choose more	✓			
feedforward explanations than experts.  H3: When using a KBS with explanation facilities, experts will choose	_			
more feedback explanations than novices.	✓			
H4: When using a KBS with explanation facilities, novices will choose more declarative knowledge explanations than experts.		√		
H5: When using a KBS with explanation facilities, novices will choose more	✓			
initial problem-solving strategy-based explanations than experts.  H6: When using a KBS with explanation facilities, experts will choose				
more more when using a KBS with explanation facilities, experts will choose		√		
procedural knowledge explanations than novices.				
H7: Experts that use feedback explanations when using a KBS with	✓	Ī		

recommendation.  H8: Experts that choose more feedback explanations when using a KBS				
with	✓			
explanation facilities will be more likely to adhere to the recommendation.	•			
Bassellier, G., Benbasat, I., and Reich, B. H. 2003. "The Influence of B				
Competence on Championing IT," Information Systems Research (14	:4), Septe	mber 200	3, pp. 31	7-336.
H1: IT knowledge in business people positively influences their intentions to champion IT in their organizations.	✓			
H2: IT experience in business people positively influences their	<b>√</b>			
intentions to champion IT in their organizations.  Bharadwaj, A. S. 2000. "A Resource-based Perspective on Information	n Tachnal	ogy Can	ability ar	d Eirm
Performance: an Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (24:1), pp. 16		ogy Cap	ability al	IU FIIIII
H1: Superior IT capability will be associated with significantly higher		√	✓	✓
profit ratios.				
H2: Superior IT capability will be associated with significantly lower cost ratios.		✓	✓	✓
Bhattacherjee, A. 2001. "Understanding Information Systems Continu	ıance: An	Expectat	ion-	
Confirmation Model," MIS Quarterly (25:3), pp. 351-370.				
H1: Users' level of satisfaction with initial IS use is positively associated with their IS continuance intention.		√	✓	
H2: Users' extent of confirmation is positively associated with their satisfaction with IS use.		√	✓	
H3: Users' perceived usefulness of IS use is positively associated with			,	<b>,</b>
their satisfaction with IS use.		✓	✓	✓
H4: Users' IS continuance intention is positively associated with their perceived usefulness of IS use.		✓	✓	
H5: Users' extent of confirmation is positively associated with their perceived usefulness of IS use.		✓	<b>√</b>	
Bhattacherjee, A., and Premkumar, G. 2004. "Understanding Changes	in Belief	and Attit	ude Tow	ard
Information Technology Usage: A Theoretical Model and Longitudina				
229-254.		_		
RQ1: Do IT users' beliefs and attitude toward IT usage change over		✓		
time as they experience IT usage first-hand? NOTE (1): We adopted the first research question (RQ) out of three RQs ir	n the nane	since it r	enresent	s the
research model (Figure 1) of the paper sufficiently.	i tile pape	Sirice it i	ергезепі	S li IC
NOTE (2): The authors did not present their research hypotheses explicitly	For your	reference	the follo	wina
hypotheses are derived from Figure 1 of their paper.	o. you.	1010101100	,	,g
H1: Beliefs (Forwards-looking)(+)> Beliefs (Modified)				
H2: Beliefs (Forwards-looking)(-)> Disconfirmation				
H3: Beliefs (Forwards-looking)(+)> Satisfaction				
H4: Beliefs (Forwards-looking)(+)> Attitude (Initial)				
H5: Disconfirmation(+)> Beliefs (Modified)				
H6: Satisfaction(+)> Attitude (Modified)				
H7: Attitude (Initial)(+)> Attitude (Modified)				
H8: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Attitude (Modified)				
1 to. Deliets (Modified)(+)> Attitude (Modified)				
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)				
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)	Intention	Formatio	on in	
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral				and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Society				and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socoganizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socorganizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be.				and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socorganizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socogranizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more		ological	Forces, √	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socogranizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be.		ological √	Forces,  √	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socionganizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing		ological √	Forces,  √	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Socionganizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be.		ological  √  √	Forces,  √  √	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111. H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be.		ological  √  √	Forces,  √  √	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be.		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be. H6: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be.		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be. H6: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H7: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be.		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be. H6: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H7: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H8: The greater the extent to which the organizational climate is		ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified) H10: Attitude (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)  Bock, G. W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y. G., and Lee, J. N. 2005. "Behavioral Knowledge Sharing: Examining the Roles of Extrinsic Motivators, Soc Organizational Climate," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 87-111.  H1: The more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H2: The greater the anticipated extrinsic rewards are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H3: The greater the anticipated reciprocal relationships are, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H4: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H5: The greater the sense of self-worth through knowledge sharing behavior is, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be. H6: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the greater the intention to share knowledge will be. H7: The greater the subjective norm to share knowledge is, the more favorable the attitude toward knowledge sharing will be. H8: The greater the extent to which the organizational climate is perceived to be characterized by fairness, innovativeness and affiliation, the greater the subjective norm to share knowledge will be.	cial-Psych	ological	Forces,	and
H9: Beliefs (Modified)(+)> Intention (Modified)	cial-Psych	ological	Forces,	and

the greater the intention to share knowledge will be.  Brown, S. A., and Venkatesh, V. 2005. "Model of Adoption of Technol	ogy in Ho	ıseholde	: A Base	line
Model Test and Extension Incorporating Household Life Cycle," <i>MIS</i>				
H1: Marital status and age will moderate the relationship between	Quarterly (	23.3), pp	. 555-42	J.
applications for personal use and intention to adopt a PC for household				
use, such that applications for personal use increases in importance as	✓			
age increases, particularly for those households in which there are				
married couples.				
H2: Child's age will moderate the relationship between utility for children				
and intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that utility for		✓		
children increases in importance as the child's age increases.				
H3: Age will moderate the relationship between utility for work-related				
use and intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that utility for	√			
work-related use increases in importance until retirement age, at which	ľ			
point utility for work-related use is no longer relevant.				
H4: Age will moderate the relationship between applications for fun and				
intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that applications for fun	✓			
decreases in importance as age increases.				
H5: Age will moderate the relationship between status gains and				
intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that status gains	✓			
decreases in importance as age increases.				
H6: Age, marital status, and income will moderate the relationship				
between the normative beliefs (i.e., friends and family, secondary				
sources, and workplace referents) and intention to adopt a PC for	✓			
household use, such that normative beliefs increases in importance with	]			
increasing age and decreasing income, particularly for those who are				
married.				
H7: Age and income will moderate the relationship between the external				
control beliefs (i.e., fear of technological advances, declining cost, and				
cost) and intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that external	✓			
control beliefs increases in importance as age increases and income				
decreases.				
H8: Age will moderate the relationship between the internal control				
beliefs (i.e., perceived ease of use and requisite knowledge) and	√			
intention to adopt a PC for household use, such that internal control	•			
beliefs increase in importance as age increases.				
Chau, P. Y. K., and Tam, K. Y. 1997. "Factors Affecting the Adoption	of Open Sy	stems: A	n Explo	ratory
Study," MIS Quarterly (21:1), pp. 1-24.	•		-	
H1: Higher levels of market uncertainty will positively affect the	√			
likelihood of open systems adoption.	,			
H2: Higher levels of perceived benefits of adopting an open system will		✓	√	
positively affect the likelihood of open systems adoption.			,	
H3: Higher levels of perceived barriers to adopting an open system will		✓	✓	
negatively affect the likelihood of open systems adoption.			,	
H4: Higher levels of perceived importance of standard compliance,		,		
interoperability and interconnectivity to an organization will positively		✓		
affect the likelihood of open systems adoption.				
H5: Higher degrees of complexity of IT infrastructure will positively affect	✓			
the likelihood of open systems adoption.	,			
H6: Higher levels of satisfaction with existing systems will negatively		✓		
affect the likelihood of open systems adoption.		•		
H7: Higher degrees of formalization on systems development and				
management will positively affect the likelihood of open systems	√			
adoption.				
Chidambaram, L. 1996. "Relational Development in Computer-suppo	rted Group	s," MIS (	Quarterly	/ (20:2),
pp. 143-165				
S1: Computer-supported teams need longer time to develop close		✓		
relations compared to face-to-face teams. (p. 144)		•		
S2: The model this study proposes to test is predicated on SIPs				
arguments that, over a period of time, groups using computers will		✓		
gradually develop close relational ties, despite some initial difficulties.		,		
(p. 146)				
NOTE: The author did not specify theoretical statements. Testable statem	ents (and to	ested in th	ne lab	
experiment) are extracted from the paper.				
Choudhury, V., and Sampler, J. 1997. "Information Specificity and En	vironment	al Scann	ing: an	
Economic Perspective," MIS Quarterly (21:1), pp. 25-53.				
P1: An organization will increase the frequency with which it monitors a		✓		
potential source of information in the environment until the point at				
which either (1) the marginal increase in surveillance costs is equal to				
the marginal reduction in the expected opportunity costs or (2) the				
probability of capturing the information is 1, whichever comes first.				
Frontle en				
Further:				

source = (Expected value of the information) II (Probability of failing to appture the information in a timely manner).  and Probability of failing to capture the information in a timely manner = f (Frequency with which the source is monitored, Time specificity in acquisition of the information).  P2: Organizations will outsource the acquisition of the information).  P2: Organizations will outsource the acquisition of the information.  P2: Organizations will outsource the acquisition of the information in the its low in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity.  P3a: Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P3b: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P3c: For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Test." MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  Hi: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the information is low and the properties of the information					
rapture the information in a timely manner), and in a timely manner) and in a timely manner in the probability of failing to capture the information in a timely manner = f (Frequency with which the source is monitored, Time specificity in acquisition of the information).  2. Organizations will outsource the acquisition of environmental information that is low in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity for acquiring information that is high in enveloped specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  2. Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  2. For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the intormation is bigh.  2. The internal of the scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the intormation is bigh.  3. The internal of the scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the intormation is bigh.  4. The internal of the scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the intormation is bigh.  5. The internal of the scanning unit is might be the individual's computer self-efficacy.  5. The internal of the use of the technology by others in the individual's condition of the individual's computer self-efficacy.  5. The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's computer self-efficacy.  6. The higher the use of the technology by others in the organization, the inject the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her individual's computer self-efficacy,	Expected opportunity costs of failing to capture information from a				
Probability of failing to capture the information in a timely manner = f (Frequency with which the source is monitored, Time specificity in acquisition of the information).  P2. Organizations will outsource the acquisition of environmental information that is tow in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in graphizational knowledge specificity.  P3a: Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in graphizational knowledge specificity.  P3a: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P3a: Or information that is low in knowledge specificity in use of the medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P3a: Or information that is low in knowledge specificity in use of the medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P3a: Or information that is low in knowledge specificity in use of the medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates in the knowledge specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specific of the specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specificity of the specificity of the specificity in use of the medium specific of the specificity of the spec					
Probability of failing to capture the information in a timely manner = f [Frequency with which the source is monitored. Time specificity in acquisition of the information).  22. Organizations will outsource the acquisition of environmental information that is low in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity.  28.3. Decision makers will designate the task of acquiring information with incoveredge specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  29.5. Cero information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  29.5. For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until the knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquiring information with the formation is logic.  20. The information is light.  20. The information is light.  21. The higher the encouragement of use by members of the defidicacy.  22. The higher the encouragement of use by members of the defidicacy.  23. The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  24. The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her defect on the proper					
### A Company of the Hornor State of the Horno					
P2: Organizations will outsource the acquisition of environmental information that is low in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity in acquisition makers will personally acquire information that is high in monowledge specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P30: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  P30: For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to will a central environmental scanning until if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Composau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 188-211.  HI: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's enterone group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her ins/her the individual's computer	(Frequency with which the source is monitored, Time specificity in				
information that is low in organizational knowledge specificity but will retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity?  Pasa: Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in workedge specificity in acquisition.  Pasa: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Pasi: Cer information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Test; "MS Quarterly (1922), pp. 189-211.  Hit: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Let The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  Ha: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's experience group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  Ha: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's experience group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  Ha: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Ha: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her user of computers.  Ha: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her user of computers.  Ha: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the hig	acquisition of the information).				
retain internally the responsibility for acquiring information that is high in organizational knowledge specificity.  Pas. Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in knowledge specificity in acquisition.  Pab: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Pac: For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until if the knowledge specificity in use of the normation is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in acquisition.  In the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information in the inf					
proganizational knowledge specificity.  Pala: Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in knowledge specificity in acquisition.  Pala: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Palo: For information that is tow in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until of the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Composau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Tost," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  Hi: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  Hi: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the individual's computer self-efficacy, the highe			✓		
P3a: Decision makers will personally acquire information that is high in knowledge specificity in acquisition. P3b: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates. P3c: For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning until if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the low and (b) the low and					
An acquisition in acquisition.  Pablo Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Pasic For information that is tow in knowledge specificity in acquisition. Managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  H. The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher higher higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher higher higher higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher			,		
medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Pac: For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  HI: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HIZ: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HIZ: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HI: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HI: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  HI: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her by the properties of the properties of the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her by the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her by the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her and the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her and the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the hi	knowledge specificity in acquisition.		✓		
Results specificity in acquisition to subordinates.  Results For information that is low in knowledge specificity in acquisition, managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low. A 1985. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test." Mis Quarterly (1922, pp. 1892-211.  HI: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HI: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  HI: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HI: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  HI: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  HI: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her users of the midvidual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  HI: The higher the individual's computer self-ef	P3b: Decision makers will delegate the task of acquiring information with		J		
managers will delegate the task of acquiring information to (a) a central environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is light, as well as the property of the individual's computer self-efficacy. He higher the individual's computer self-efficacy of the property of the pro	medium specificity in acquisition to subordinates.				
environmental scanning unit if the knowledge specificity in use of the Information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the Information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  H1: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the Individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the Individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her but on the property of the higher his/her but individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her but individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her affect (or liking) or computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) or computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) or the behavior.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H4: The higher the individual's com					
Information is low and (b) to a subordinate if the knowledge specificity in use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Tost," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  It: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the Individual's cererous group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the Individual's cererous group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's efference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her users in the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H12: The higher the i		,			
use of the information is high.  Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  H1: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's expertance of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her butcome expectations.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her article of ill-efficacy and the putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her article of ill-efficacy and the putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization and the putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization and the putcome expectations.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the in		<b>'</b>			
Compeau, D. R., and Higgins, C. A. 1995. "Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test;" MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  H1: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her because the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her self-efficacy in the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her self-efficacy in the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her self-efficacy in the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her self-efficacy in the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her his/her the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her his/her higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her his/her his/her the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: T					
Initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.  H: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's expertance group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her be support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her self-efficacy the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her diffect (or liking) of computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her diffect (or liking) of computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her and the properties of the p	<u> </u>	evelopmen	t of a Me	easure ai	nd
ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self- efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her putcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her putcome expectations.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her putcome expectations.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal ou	Initial Test," MIS Quarterly (19:2), pp. 189-211.				
efficacy.  H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization in the reference of the reference	H1: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the				
H2: The higher the encouragement of use by members of the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her described in the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her described in the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her described in the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her described in the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her described in the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H10: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her loop the higher the individual's computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use of computers.  H3: The higher the individu			√		
ndividual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her player the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization and the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization and the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organization and the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her and the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her and the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her his/her his/her the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H5: The higher the individual's performance re		<b></b>			
expectations.  H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her fourtier the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her support for computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her fourtier the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her support for computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her factor (or liking) of computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H6: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H7: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the highe			,		
H3: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's occome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her of computer anxiety.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her occupated anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her occupater of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her energy and individual relations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her energy and individual relations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her energy and individual relations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her energy and individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her ener			'		
reference group, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her outcome expectations.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her outcome expectations are self-efficacy, the lower his/her outcome expectations are self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compoau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her organizer anxiety.  H3: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individua					
H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H5: The higher the individual's personal outcome			✓		
reference group, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her dividual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her dividual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal unit on the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectat	H4: The higher the use of the technology by others in the individual's		,		
higher the individual's computer self-efficacy.  H6: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her or elated outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her or elated outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her or elated outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her or	reference group, the higher the individual's outcome expectations.		•		
higher the individual's computer self-efficacy. H7: The higher the support for computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use. H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her as of computers. H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H15: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H3: The higher the individual's performance related	H5: The higher the support for computer users in the organization, the		<b>√</b>		
higher the individual's outcome expectations.  H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H6: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.			· •		
H7: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her outcome expectations.  H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D, R., Higgins, C, A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study." MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with affect (or liking) of computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H7: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.			✓		
Dutcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H15: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her overformance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her oversonal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her oversonal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her oversonal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her oversonal outcome expectations.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her oversonal outcome expectations.  H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.					
H8: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study." MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with affect (or liking) of computer use.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her with affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher this/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.			✓	√	
Affect (or liking) of computer use.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the individual's performance related outcom					
H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers. H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers. Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158. H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations. H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use. H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the indivi			✓	✓	
H10: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her personal outcome expectations.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.	H9: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her		,	,	
his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her affect (or liking) of computers.  H5: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.	computer anxiety.		•	٧	
H11: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers.  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher the			✓	✓	
his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.				,	
H12: The higher the individual's outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.			✓		
his/her use of computers. H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158. H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations. H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use. H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.					
H13: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher his/her use of computers.  H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's performance evapectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			✓		
his/her use of computers. H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers. Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158. H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations. H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use. H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H8: The higher his/her use of computers. H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the					
H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use of computers.  Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations. H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations. H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use. H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety. H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior. H7: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers. H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	his/her use of computers.		<b>√</b>	✓	
Compeau, D. R., Higgins, C. A., and Huff, S. 1999. "Social Cognitive Theory and Individual Reactions to Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	H14: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use		.1	./	
Computing Technology: A Longitudinal Study," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 145-158.  H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	of computers.				
H1: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the				ıal React	tions to
performance related outcome expectations.  H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the		pp. 145-15	8.	_	
H2: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			✓	√	
personal outcome expectations.  H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			·	<u> </u>	
H3: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			✓	✓	
affect (or liking) of computer use.  H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the					
H4: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the lower his/her computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			√	√	
computer anxiety.  H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the					
H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			√	√	
use of computers  H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	H5: The higher the individual's computer self-efficacy, the higher his/her		,	,	
H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	use of computers		_ ′	L <sup>✓</sup>	
H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	H6: The higher the individual's performance related outcome		J		
higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.  H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	expectations, the higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.				
H8: The higher the individual's performance related outcome expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	H7: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the		✓		
expectations, the higher his/her use of computers.  H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the	higher his/her affect (or liking) for the behavior.				
H9: The higher the individual's personal outcome expectations, the			✓		
inglier memor add or computere.			✓		
	g	1		<del>                                     </del>	

H10: The higher the individual's affect for computer use, the higher		✓	√	
his/her use of computers.  H11: The higher the individual's computer anxiety, the lower his/her use				
of computers.		√	√	
Daft, R. L., Lengel, R. H., and Trevino, L. K. 1987. "Message Equivoca	lity, Media	Selection	n, and M	anager
Performance: Implications for Information Systems," MIS Quarterly (			•	
H1: Managerial information processing will be characterized by a		✓		
positive relationship between message equivocality and media richness.				
H2: Managers will select oral media for communication episodes high in		,		
equivocality and written media for communication episodes low in equivocality.		✓		
H3: Managers who are sensitive to the relationship between equivocality				
and media richness are more likely to be rated as high performers.		√		
Davis, F. D. 1989. "Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and	User Acc	eptance	of Inform	ation
Technology," MIS Quarterly (13:3), pp. 318-340.		•		
H1: Perceived usefulness> Attitude toward using the system		✓	✓	✓
H2: Perceived ease of use> Attitude toward using the system		✓	✓	✓
DeLone, W. H., and McLean, E. R. 1992. "Information Systems Succe	ss: The Qu	est for t	he Depen	dent
Variable," Information Systems Research (3:1), pp. 60-96.				
S1: SYSTEM QUALITY and INFORMATION QUALITY singularly and		√		√
jointly affect both USE ad USER SATISFACTION (p. 83)				
S2: The amount of USE can affect the degree of USER SATISFACTION		√		
positively or negatively (p. 83) S3: The degree of USER SATISFACTION can affect the amount of USE				
positively or negatively (p. 83)		√		
S4: USE and USER SATISFACTION are direct antecedents of				
INDIVIDUAL IMPACT (p. 83, 87)		√		
S5: [INDIVIDUAL] IMPACT on individual performance should eventually		<b>√</b>		
have some ORGANIZATIONAL IMPACT (p. 87)				
Dennis, A. R., Fuller, R. M., and Valacich, J. S. 2008. "Media, Tasks, A	and Commi	unicatior	n Process	ses: A
Theory Of Media Synchronicity." MIS Quarterly (32:3), pp. 575-600.				
P1: Communication performance will depend on the fit between a medium	i's synchror	nicity and	the funda	amental
communication processes being performed. P1a: For communication processes in which convergence on meaning				
is the goal, use of higher synchronicity media will lead to better		√		
communication performance.				
P1b: For communication processes in which the conveyance of				
information is the goal, use of lower synchronicity media will lead to		√		
better communication performance.				
P2: Transmission velocity improves shared focus which will have a		✓		
positive impact on a medium's capability to support synchronicity.				
P3: Parallelism lowers shared focus which will have a negative impact on a medium's capability to support synchronicity.		√		
P4a: Media with more natural symbol sets (physical, visual, and verbal)				
have a greater capability to support synchronicity as compared to media		✓		
with less natural symbol sets (written or typed).				
P4b: Using a medium with a symbol set better suited to the content of				
the message will improve information transmission and information		√		
processing, and therefore will have a greater capacity to support				
synchronicity. P5: Rehearsability lowers shared focus, which will have a negative				
impact on a medium's capability to support synchronicity.	√			
P6: Reprocessability lowers shared focus, which will have a negative				
impact on a medium's capability to support synchronicity.	√			
P7: Although individuals working together on tasks will benefit from the us	e of both hi	gh and lo	w synchro	onicity
media, their need for media synchronicity will depend on their level of fam	iliarity with	each othe	∍r, with the	e task,
and with the media.	_			
P7a: Individuals working together with well established norms working	,			
on familiar tasks using familiar media will have the least need to use media supporting high synchronicity.	<b> </b>			
P7b: Individuals working together without well established norms		H		-
working on unfamiliar tasks using unfamiliar media will have the greatest	√			
need to use media supporting high synchronicity.				
Dimoka, A., Hong, Y., and Pavlou, P. A. 2012. "On Product Uncertaint	y in Online	Markets	s: Theory	and
Evidence," MIS Quarterly (36:2), pp. 395-426.	T	T		
H1: Product uncertainty is distinct from, yet influenced by, seller		√	✓	
uncertainty.			<b></b>	
H2a: Product uncertainty (description and performance) is negatively associated with price premiums.		✓	✓	
H2b: Seller uncertainty (adverse selection and moral hazard) is				
negatively associated with price premiums.		√	√	
H3: The diagnosticity of online product descriptions (textual, visual, and		√	√	

H4: The negative effect of the diagnosticity of online product descriptions on product uncertainty is negatively moderated (attenuated)		✓	✓	
by seller uncertainty.  H5: The existence of third-party product assurances (inspection, history		<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	
eport, warranty) is negatively associated with product uncertainty.  Enns, H. G., Huff, S. L., and Higgins, C. A. 2003. "CIO Lateral Influenc	e Behavio			<u>,</u>
Commitment to Strategic Information Systems," MIS Quarterly (27:1)				
H1: Rational persuasion will be positively related to the influence outcome.		✓	√	
H2: Consultation will be positively related to the influence outcome.		<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	
H3: Personal appeal will be positively related to the influence outcome.	√			
H4: Ingratiation will be negatively related to the influence outcome.	✓			
H5: Exchange will be negatively related to the influence outcome.  H6: Coalition will be negatively related to the influence outcome.	<b>√</b>			
H7: Pressure will be negatively related to the influence outcome.	<b>√</b>			
Gattiker, T. F., and Goodhue, D. L. 2005. "What Happens After ERP In	plementa	tion: Und	lerstand	ing the
Impact of Interdependence and Differentiation on Plant-Level Outcon	nes," <i>MIS</i> (	Quarterly	′ (29:3), <sub> </sub>	p. 559
585. H1a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, the greater the				Ī
interdependence of one plant with other plants in the organization, the		1		J
greater the ERP-related coordination improvements accrued by that plant.		`		•
H1b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, the greater the				
interdependence of one plant with other plants in the organization, the		✓		✓
greater the ERP-related task efficiency improvements accrued by that plant.				,
H2a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, the greater the				
differentiation of a plant from the other plants in an organization, the		✓		
lower the ERP-related coordination improvements accrued by that plant.  H2b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, the greater the				
differentiation of a plant from the other plant in an organization, the		,		
lower the ERP-related task efficiency improvements accrued by that		✓		
plant. H3a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, customization moderates				
the negative impact of an individual plant's differentiation on	√			
coordination improvements from ERP accrued to that plant.				
H3b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, customization moderates the negative impact of an individual plant's differentiation on task efficiency improvements of ERP accrued to that plant.	✓			
H4a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, greater time elapsed since ERP implementation is associated with greater coordination		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
improvements of ERP accrued to that plant.				
H4b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, grater time elapsed since ERP implementation is associated with greater task efficiency		✓		✓
improvements of ERP accrued to that plant.		`		•
H5a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, greater data quality is		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
associated with greater coordination improvements for the plant.  H5b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, greater data quality is		,		·
associated with greater task efficiency for that plant.		√		√
H6a: In a plant within an ERP implementation, greater task efficiency is		✓		
associated with greater local (plant) level overall benefits from ERP.  H6b: In a plant within an ERP implementation, greater improvements in		-		
coordination with other subunits are associated with greater local (plant)		✓		
level overall benefits from ERP.				
H6c: In a plant within and ERP implementation, greater data quality is associated with greater local level overall benefits from ERP.		✓		
Gefen, D., Karahanna, E, and Straub, D. W. 2003. "Trust and TAM in C Model," MIS Quarterly (27:1), pp. 51-90.	Inline Sho	pping: A	n Integra	ated
H1: Perceived Usefulness (PU) will positively affect intended use of a		<b>√</b>	,	✓
business-to-consumer Web site.			✓	
H2: Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) will positively affect intended use of a business-to-consumer Web site.		✓	✓	✓
H3: PEOU will positively affect PU of a business-to-consumer Web site.	<b>√</b>			
H4: Trust in the e-vendor will positively affect intended use of a		√	√	
business-to-consumer Web site. H5: Trust will positively affect PU.	<b>√</b>	<del>-</del>		1
H6: Familiarity with a trustworthy e-vendor will positively affect trust in	· ·			<b> </b>
that e-vendor.		<b>√</b>	✓	
H7: Calculative-based beliefs will positively affect trust in an e-vendor.		<b>√</b>		
H8: Perceptions of situational normality will positively affect trust in an e-		<b>√</b>		1

vendor.	Ī	Ī	Ī	
H9: Perceptions of structural assurance built into a Web site will		√		J
positively affect trust in an e-vendor.		<b>'</b>		•
H10: PEOU will positively affect trust in an e-vendor.	✓			
H11: Situational normality will positively affect PEOU.		✓		
H12: Familiarity with the e-vendor will positively affect PEOU.	√		<u> </u>	
Goodhue, D. L., and Thompson, R. L. 1995. "Task-technology Fit and	l Individual	Perform	nance," <i>N</i>	IIS
Quarterly (19:2), pp. 213-236. P1: User evaluations of task-technology fit will be affected by both task				
characteristics and characteristics of the technology.	✓			
P2: User evaluations of task-technology fit will influence the utilization of	,			
information systems by individuals.	✓			
P3: User evaluations of task-technology fit will have additional				
explanatory power in predicting perceived performance impacts beyond	✓			
that from utilization alone.				
Griffith, T. L., Fuller, M. A., and Northcraft, G. B. 1998. "Facilitator Inf			pport Sy	stems
Intended and Unintended Effects," Information Systems Research (9 P1: The strength of a facilitator's ability to influence to control the	:1), pp. 20-	36. I	1	
group's process will be a function of the facilitator's power.		✓		
P2: The strength of a facilitator's influence will be greater if the facilitator				
has expert power or status than if the facilitator has only legitimate		✓		
power.				
P3: The effects of information processing on facilitator influence will be		✓		
moderated by facilitator power.				
P4: Facilitator influence is more likely to be intentional and not impartial		,		
when facilitators have agendas that conflict with the agenda of the		✓		
group. P5: Facilitator influence will be moderated by task characteristics.		<b>√</b>	1	
P6: Facilitator awareness of power and information processing will		· ·		
moderate facilitator influence.		✓		
Griffith, T. L., Sawyer, J. E., and Neale, M. A. 2003. "Virtualness and I	Cnowledge	in Team	s: Manac	ina
the Love Triangle of Organizations, Individuals, and Information Tec				
265-287.	0,7	-	,	,, , , ,
P1a: More virtual teams are more likely to transform implicit knowledge		✓		
into explicit knowledge than are less virtual teams.		<u> </u>		
P1b: More virtual teams are more likely to have access to their extant		✓		
explicit knowledge than are less virtual teams.		·		
P2: Implicit knowledge can be transferred to explicit knowledge to the extent that a proactive effort is made to verbalize rules, terminology, and		✓		
descriptions		<b>'</b>		
P3a: Having acquired tacit knowledge from collocated sources,				
members of more virtual teams will be less able to transfer this		✓		
knowledge to their teams than would members of less virtual teams.				
P3b: Individual members of more virtual teams are less likely to acquire				
tacit knowledge from their teammates than are members of less virtual		√		
teams.				
P4a: More virtual teams will have greater difficulty forming collective knowledge than will less virtual teams. This effect will be moderated by	✓			
their experienced richness of communication.	<b>'</b>			
P4b: To the extent that collective knowledge is formed in more virtual	1	<del> </del>	1	
teams, their collective knowledge is expected to be more accessible via		<b> </b> ,		
technological tools, than would the collective knowledge of less virtual		✓		
teams.				
P5a: More virtual teams have a greater likelihood of enacting an				
independent approach to their tasks and, therefore, are expected to	✓			
have less shared understanding of these tasks than less virtual teams.				
P5b: Access to and appropriation of tools and structures that support highly interdependent work will moderate this result on shared		✓		
knowledge.		<b>l</b> '		
P6: The transition of potential team knowledge to usable knowledge is		<b>,</b>	1	
positively moderated by individual absorptive capacity.		✓	<u> </u>	
P7: To the extent that more virtual work limits the social interaction of				
the team members, virtual team work will reduce the absorptive capacity		√		
of team members.	<u> </u>	<b>!</b>	<u> </u>	
P8: The transition of potential team knowledge to usable knowledge is		<b>,</b>		
positively moderated by individuals' connections to relevant communities of practice.		✓		
P9a: More virtual teams will have greater access to communities of		<del>                                     </del>		
practice than will less virtual teams.	✓			
P9b: Tacit knowledge from members' links to communities of practice		1	1	
are less likely to be disseminated within more virtual teams than they		✓		
are within less virtual teams.				
	-		-	

knowledge will be positively moderated by team transactive memory.				
P11a: More virtual teams will have lower transactive memory development than less virtual teams.	✓			
P11b: The expected overall negative relationship between teams working more virtually and the development of transactive memory will be mitigated to the extent that technologies or organizational systems are used to support transactive memory development.	√			
P12: The transition of potential team knowledge to usable knowledge is positively moderated by the level of synergy in the team.		✓		
P13: The relationship between team virtualness and synergy will be moderated by the degree of match between team task and technology use.		✓		
Hong, W., Thong, J Y. L., and Tam, K. Y. 2004. "Does Animation Attra Effects of Flash on Information Search Performance and Perceptions (15:1), pp. 60-86.				
H1a: Response time will be shorter when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H1b: Response time will be longer when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H1c: Response time reduces to a greater extent in high than in low local density environments when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		<b>√</b>		
H1d: Response time increases to a greater extent in high than in low local density environments when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		<b>√</b>		
H2a: Recall of the target item will be different when it is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H2b: Recall of the target item will be different when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		√		
H2c: Recall of the non-target item will be higher when it is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H2d: Recall of the non-target items will be lower when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H2e: Recall of the non-target items that are not flashed will be lower when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H2f: Overall recall will be lower when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.	<b>√</b>			
H2g: Overall recall will be different when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		√		
H3a: Focused attention will be lower when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.	✓			
H3b: Focused attention will be lower when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H4a: Attitudes toward using the website will be different when the target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
H4b: Attitudes toward using the website will be less favorable when a non-target item is flashed compared to when it is not flashed.		✓		
Jarvenpaa, S. L., Shaw, T. R., and Staples, D. S. 2004. "Toward Conte Role of Trust in Global Virtual Teams," <i>Information Systems Researc</i>				: The
H1a: Initial trustworthiness has a direct, positive relationship with early	, ,,,	√		
trust.  H1b: There is a direct, positive relationship between the level of early communication by other members on the team and a member's early		<b>√</b>		
trust. H1c: A member's initial trustworthiness in the team has a direct, positive relationship with the member's early perceived cohesiveness of the team.		✓		
H2a: Early trust moderates the relationship between the level of communication by other members on the team and perceived satisfaction with the team.		✓		
H2b: Early trust moderates the relationship between the level of later communication by other members on the team and perceived cohesiveness of the team.		✓		
H2c: Early trust moderates the relationship between the level of communication by other members on the team and perceived quality of		<b>√</b>		
a team's outcome. H2d: Trust has a negligible effect on the quality of task performance.	<b>√</b>			
H3: The effect (either direct or moderation) of trust on attitudes of team members is weak in a situation with strong structure.	✓			
Johnston, A. C., and Warkentin, M. 2010. "Fear Appeals and Informat	ion Securi	ty Behav	iors: An	

to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect by syware.  H2: Self-efficacy will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Social influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt trecommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Secial influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt trecommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of the self-efficacy.  H3: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively related to EKR usage by knowledg		_	_	-	
to spyware.  H3: Self-efficacy will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Social influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H4: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A, Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A, Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Ropositions: An Empirical Invastigation," M1S Quarterly (29:1), pp. 142.  H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3: The relationship between subjective related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H4: The relationship between subjective related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H4: The relationsh	H1: Response efficacy will have a positive effect on end user intentions		√		
HZ: Self-efficacy will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Seolal influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3E: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively related to EKR usage by will negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributions under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3E: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3E: Repicrotian relation is perception and Post-adoption Beliefs, "MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H3E: The relationsh					
adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3: Social influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H4a: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H4b: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H5b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A, Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Powers in segatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak percentized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6c: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H7c: Indicating the positively related to EKR usage by					
Spyware.  H3. Social influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  H3. Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H3b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Codification effort is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: There will adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between sharing norms.  H3c: There will adopter to the perception of the propential adopters of an IT.  H3c: The relational power of the perception of the					
H3: Social influence will have a positive effect on end user intentions to adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to \$pyware.  H4: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  H5: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A, Tan, B, C, Y., and Wel, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositionies: An Empirical Investigation," MS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  H7: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2: Cognizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3: R7: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8: R8			✓		
adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to spyware.  Hai: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MRS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  Ht: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Toganizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regie positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regie positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regie positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regien of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regien of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Regien of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: The reliationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters t					
Spyware.  Hai: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalii, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation." MIS Quarterfy (29:1), pp. 1-42.  Ht. Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak for the property of					
Hal: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Has: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Responsibility of the self-efficacy."  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Responsibility of the self-efficacy."  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Responsibility of the self-efficacy."  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge Contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Hab: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Hab: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Hab: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Hai: Image is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Hai: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  Hai: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  Hai: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  Hai: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  Hai: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge co	adopt recommended individual computer security actions with respect to		✓	✓	
of response efficacy. Hab: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy. Has: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy. Has: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy. Has: Perceptions of self-efficacy. Has: Perceptions of self-efficacy. Kankanhali, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wel, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositionies: An Empirical Investigation," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (23:1), pp. 1-42. H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2b: Ocdification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H3c: Royanizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H5: Reciprority is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H6: Reciprority is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H6: Rowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H6: Rowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H6: Rowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H6: Rowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR us	spyware.				
of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Hab: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wel, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (29:1), pp. 1-42.  Ht 1: Loss of Knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Royanizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Royanizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and	H4a: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions	./			
of self-efficacy.  Has Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  His Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhali, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation." MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  Hit. Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Norganizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6c: Norwledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6c: Norwledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7c: Enjoyment in helping others is no positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7c: Enjoyment in help		•			
of self-emcacy.  Has: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Has: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Has: Perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  Hit: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  Haz: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Coganizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Haz: Coganizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Inage is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha: Report of the properties of the proper	H4b: Perceptions of threat severity will negatively influence perceptions	,			
Hös: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of response efficacy.  Höb: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Höb: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Emphrical Investigation," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (28:1), pp. 1–42.  Hit. Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZa: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  HZb: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZc: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Crodificational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Crodificational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Crodificational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Crodificational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Reporacity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Reporacity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Reporacity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Reporacity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Report to	of self-efficacy.	<b>'</b>			
perceptions of response efficacy.  Hib: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak dentification.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak dentification.  H3c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H8: The i		,			
H5b: Perceptions of threat susceptibility will negatively influence perceptions of self-efficacy.  Perceptions of self-efficacy is gostively related to EKR usage by Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak influence of the total conditions of the self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak in positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak in positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Image is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Rowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by Knowledge contributors.  H7: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Soctional Comparison of Pro-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 175-193.  H3: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intenti		<b>√</b>			
perceptions of self-efficacy.  Kankanhalla, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wai, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  HI: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3c: Inage is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3c: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6c: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H8: Tender to the pos	H5h: Percentions of threat suscentibility will negatively influence				
Kankanhalli, A., Tan, B. C. Y., and Wei, K. K. 2005. "Contributing Knowledge to Electronic Knowledge Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," <i>IMS Quarterly</i> (29:1), pp. 1-42. H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust. H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H2: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification. H3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H3: Intege is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms. H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors. H8: Tare elationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for potenti		√			
Repositories: An Empirical Investigation," MIS Quarterly (29:1), pp. 1-42.  H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H6: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Socional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H7: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for users than for between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential		wlodgo to	<u> </u>	ic Knowl	odao
H1: Loss of knowledge power is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H8: Tare relationship between attitu			Election	ic Kilowi	euge
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pre-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3: Reciproty is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999: "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H7: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be the proper for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for pot		-42. I			
H2a: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  H2b: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T8: T			√		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  HZb: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZb: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bellefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1: Haller levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2: Haller levels of hostility increase					
Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak generalized trust.  HZb: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZa: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  HZa: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  HZ: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  HZ: Inage is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZ: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZ: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZ: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  HZ: Enjowent in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bellefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  HZ: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for users of an IT.  HZ: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intent			✓		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.    V			,		
Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  HZC: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral structure of the stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: H3: H3: H3: H3: H3: H3: H3: H3			J		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between the	knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.		•		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  Ha3: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  Ha5: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  Ha6: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  Ha7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Ha7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  Ha7: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  Ha2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  Ha3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H12: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a:	H2c: Codification effort is negatively related to EKR usage by		,		
H3a: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H8: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H8: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H8: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be transported for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J, Somers, T, M, and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1: Higher levels of hostility	knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.		<b>V</b>		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction w			,		
H3b: Organizational reward is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3c: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tas			✓		
knowledge contributors under conditions of weak identification.  H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M, Tan, B, C, Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant in					
H4: Image is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H2a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3b: Hask non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavi			√		
under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters of an IT.  Karimi, J, Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  V H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  V H3: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H2: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect					
H5: Reciprocity is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H6: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect  H2: In all cultures, risk preception will have a		√			
contributors under conditions of weak pro-sharing norms.  H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H6: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect  H2: In all cultures, risk propersity will have a signif			-	ł	1
H6: Knowledge self-efficacy is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3c: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task		√			
knowledge contributors.  H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKR usage by knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H6: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H6: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfacti				-	-
Knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3c: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect			✓		
Kowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect			,		
Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Technology Adoption Across Time: A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H6: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H2: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect	H7: Enjoyment in helping others is positively related to EKB uses by				
A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beliefs," MIS Quarterly (23:2), pp. 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3c: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect			1		
H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.				
H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," <i>Information Systems Research</i> (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec		    doption		
stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bed."		    doption		
H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tea A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.		    doption		
than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tea A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.		Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Both 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be		Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.	eliefs," <i>MI</i> S	Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users	eliefs," <i>MI</i> S	Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environmental Uncertainty and Task Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.	eliefs," <i>MIS</i>	Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems Research (15:2), pp. 175-193.  H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention	eliefs," <i>MIS</i>	Adoption S <i>Quarte</i>		
H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	
H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce	Adoption 6 Quarte vertainty a	rly (23:2)	, pp.
tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bound 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce Research	Adoption 6 Quarte vertainty a	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Ted A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bound 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce Research	Adoption 6 Quarte vertainty a	rly (23:2)	, pp.
tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bota 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce Research	Adoption 6 Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of	eliefs," MIS  √  ental Unce Research	Adoption 6 Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption 6 Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Be 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of	eliefs," MIS	Adoption 6 Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wassenaar, A. 2000. "A Cross-Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3c: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with	eliefs," MIS	Adoption S Quarte	rly (23:2)	, pp.
Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Projects," MIS Quarterly (24:2), pp. 299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.	eliefs," MIS	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task	93.
299-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3c: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.	eliefs," MIS	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task	93.
H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa	eliefs," MIS       ental Unce  Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bet 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Proceedings of the post-of-the process of the same process.	eliefs," MIS      ental Unce  Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bras-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Pray9-325.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unces Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tea A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Beas-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Pray9-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on	eliefs," MIS  ental Unces Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
H2: In all cultures, risk perception will have a significant inverse effect	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tea A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption Bea 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation Process of the Presentation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation Process of tasks.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unce s Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of dynamism increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  H5: Task interdependence has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Pages-325.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unce s Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
on willingness to continue a project.	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Pressed in the propensity and risk perception.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unce s Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H1: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant inverse effect on risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unce Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.
	knowledge contributors.  Karahanna, E., Straub, D., and Chervany, N. L. 1999. "Information Tec A Cross-Sectional Comparison of Pre-adoption and Post-adoption B 183-213.  H1: The relationship between attitude and behavioral intention will be stronger for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H2: There will be more behavioral beliefs underlying attitude for users than for potential adopters of an IT.  H3: The relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intention will be stronger for potential adopters than for users of an IT.  Karimi, J., Somers, T. M., and Gupta, Y. P. 2004. "Impact of Environm Characteristics on User Satisfaction with Data," Information Systems H1a: Higher levels of dynamism increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H1b: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H2a: Higher levels of heterogeneity increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3a: Higher levels of hostility increase the non-routineness of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H3b: Higher levels of hostility increase the interdependence of tasks.  H4: Task non-routineness has negative effects on user satisfaction with data.  Keil, M., Tan, B. C. Y., Wei, K. K., Saarinen, T., Tuunainen, V., and Wa Cultural Study on Escalation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation of Commitment Behavior in Software Presentation will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.  H1a: The inverse relationship between risk propensity and risk perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.	eliefs," MIS  ental Unce Research	ertainty a (15:2), p	and Task op. 175-1	93.

H3: In all cultures, risk propensity will have a significant direct effect on willingness to continue a project.	√			
H4: In all cultures, level of sunk cost will have a significant inverse effect	✓			
on risk perception.  H4a: The inverse relationship between level of sunk cost and risk				
perception will be stronger in cultures lower on uncertainty avoidance.	✓			
H5: In all cultures, level of sunk cost will have a significant direct effect on willingness to continue a project.	✓			
Kettinger, W. J., and Lee, C. C. 2005. "Zones of Tolerance Alternative	Scales for	Measur	ing Infor	mation
Systems Service Quality," MIS Quarterly (29:4), pp. 607-623.		•		
S1: Is an IS-adapted ZOT SERVQUAL psychometrically sound? (p. 610)	√			
S2: More specifically, do the two expectation levels of IS service quality (desired and adequate) and the perceived IS service level possess the same dimensions of SERVQUAL (including common items)? (p. 610)	✓			
Kim, K. K., and Michelman, J. E. 1990. "An Examination of Factors for		gic Use	of Inform	nation
Systems in the Health Care Industry," MIS Quarterly (14:2), pp. 201-2' P1: For the integration of HIS [Hospital Information Systems] to be	15.	1		
successful, the conflict between physicians and administrators is an important factor that a hospital must effectively deal with.		√		
P2: Integration of isolated TPS/IRS [Transaction Processing Systems,				
Information Reporting Systems] throughout the organization is an important factor in the strategic use of healthcare information systems.		√		
P3: Healthcare organizations can achieve competitive advantages				<b>√</b>
through the successful application of TPS/IRS to strategic areas.	n Doronoot	ives on A	Automoti	
Kim, S. S., Malhotra, N. K., and Narasimhan, S. 2005. "Two Competing A Theoretical and Empirical Comparison," <i>Information Systems Research</i>				c use:
H1-0: As past use increases, the influence of users' evaluations on usage intention will increase or at least stay the same.	,	√		
H1-A: As past use increases, the influence of users' evaluations on				
usage intention will decrease.  H2-0: As past use increases, the influence of usage intention on IT use				
will increase or at least stay the same.  H2-A: As past use increases, the influence of usage intention on IT use		√		
will decrease.				
NOTE: H1-0, H2-0 (null hypotheses), H1-A, H2-A (alternative hypotheses)				
Ko D.C. Kirech I. I. and King W.D. 2005 "Antocodonte of Knowle				
Ko, D. G., Kirsch, L. J., and King, W. R. 2005. "Antecedents of Knowle Clients in Enterprise System Implementations." MIS Quarterly (29:1).		fer from	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a			Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1),		<b>√</b>	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer.			Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer.		<b>√</b>	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the		<b>√</b>	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the		√ √	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the		4 4 4 4 4	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the	pp. 59-85.	4 4 4 4 4	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer.	pp. 59-85.	4 4 4 4 4 4	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer.	pp. 59-85.	4 4 4 4 4	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer.	pp. 59-85.	4 4 4 4 4 4	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4}	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence,	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4}	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4}	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H12: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client.	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4}	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H12: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{4}	Consulta	ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H12: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. Koh, C., Ang, S., and Straub, D. W. 2004. "IT Outsourcing Success: A	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4}		ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H12: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. Koh, C., Ang, S., and Straub, D. W. 2004. "IT Outsourcing Success: A Perspective," Information Systems Research (15:4), pp. 356-373.	pp. 59-85.	√  √  √  √  √  √  √  √  √  gical Cor		ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. K0h, C., Ang, S., and Straub, D. W. 2004. "IT Outsourcing Success: A Perspective," Information Systems Research (15:4), pp. 356-373.	pp. 59-85.	\frac{1}{4}		ants to
Clients in Enterprise System Implementations," MIS Quarterly (29:1), H1: The more arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client, the less the knowledge transfer. H2: The greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H3: The greater the absorptive capacity of a client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H4: The more intrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H5: The more intrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H6: The more extrinsically motivated the client, the greater the knowledge transfer. H7: The more extrinsically motivated the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H8: The more credible the consultant, the greater the knowledge transfer. H9: The more credible the consultant, the less arduous the relationship between consultant and client. H10: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H11: The greater a client's communication encoding competence, the less arduous the relationship between a consultant and a client. H12: The greater a client's communication decoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. H13: The greater a consultant's communication encoding competence, the greater the shared understanding between a consultant and a client. Koh, C., Ang, S., and Straub, D. W. 2004. "IT Outsourcing Success: A Perspective," Information Systems Research (15:4), pp. 356-373.	pp. 59-85.	√  √  √  √  √  √  √  √  √  gical Cor		ants to

Leidner, D. E., and Kayworth, T. 2006. "Review: A Review of Culture i	in Informat	ion Syste	ems Rese	earch:
Toward a Theory of Information Technology Conflict," MIS Quarterly				
P1a: The greater the cultural distance between the group responsible				
for championing the IT and the group adopting the IT, the greater the		√		
system conflict experienced by the group adopting the IT.  P1b: The greater the breadth of IT implementation across groups, the				
greater the system conflict experienced by the organization.		✓		
P1c: The greater the system conflict experienced by a group, the less				
likely the group is to be a forerunner in the adoption of the system.		✓		
P1d: The greater the system conflict experienced by a group, the		✓		
greater the modification of use to support the group's values.		•		
P2a: The lower the contribution conflict experienced by the most				
powerful actors within a group, the lower the contribution conflict		✓		
experienced by the group.  P2b: The lower the contribution conflict in a group to which another				
group aspires, the lower the contribution conflict in the aspiring group.	✓			
P2c: The greater the contribution conflict experienced by a group, the				
less strategic a role that IT will play in that group.		✓		
P2d: The greater the contribution conflict experienced by a group, the		✓		
less likely the innovative uses of IT by the group.		•		
P3a: The greater the difference in the IT values between the champion		_		
group and the user group, the greater the vision conflict experienced by		√		
the user group.				
P3b: The lesser the involvement of the most powerful within a user group in development, the greater the vision conflict experienced by the		√		
user group.		•		
P3c: The higher the vision conflict a group has with respect to a system,		,		
the lower the adoption rate of the system by the group.		✓		
P3d: The greater the vision conflict experienced by a group, the greater		✓		
the potential change to the group's IT values.		•		
P4: Managers can reduce all forms of conflict by promoting shared IT	✓			
values.				
P5: The emergence and resolution of the three types of conflict will, over time, result in cultural changes. [three types of conflict: system conflict,	✓			
contribution conflict, vision conflict]	<b>'</b>			
Lewis, W., Agarwal, R., and Sambamurthy, V. 2003. "Sources of Influ	ence on Be	liefs abo	out Inform	nation
Technology Use: An Empirical Study of Knowledge Workers," MIS Q	· · · · · ·	, un	· u.c u	
i recimology obe. An Empirical Study of Milowieuge Workers, 1975 Q	uarterly (27	7:4), pp. (	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant		7:4), pp. (	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.	uarterly (27 √	7:4), pp. (	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology		7:4), pp. (	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the		7:4), pp. ( √	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.		7:4), pp. ( √	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology		<b>√</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the		√ √	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.		<b>√</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the		<b>√</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.		<b>✓</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on		<b>* * *</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.		<b>✓</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology		<b>4 4 4 4</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the		<b>* * *</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.		\frac{1}{4}	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on		<b>4 4 4 4</b>	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.		\frac{1}{4}	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.		\frac{1}{4}	657-678.	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.	✓	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.	√ tems: The I	√ √ √ √		
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter	√ tems: The I	√ √ √ √		
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation	√ tems: The I	√ √ √ √		
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation process.	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation process.  H2: Higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation within the organization.	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	onal
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a tech	√ tems: The I	√	Institutio	onal
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation process.  H2: Higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation within the organization.  H3a: Higher levels of mimetic pressures lead to stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP assimilation.	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	onal
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a tech	√ tems: The I	√	Institutio	onal
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  Liang, H., Saraf, N., and Hu, Q. 2007. "Assimilation of Enterprise Syst Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management," MIS Quarter H1: Stronger top management beliefs about the benefits of ERP lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation process.  H2: Higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation.  H3a: Higher levels of mimetic pressures lead to higher levels of top management participation in the ERP assimilation.	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	onal
H1: Beliefs about the ease of use of a technology have a significant positive influence on beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2a: Perceived top management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H2b: Perceived local management support for the use of a technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H3: Perceived social influence from referent others have a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of the technology.  H4a: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4b: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the usefulness of a technology.  H4c: Computer self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a technology.  H4d: Personal innovativeness in the domain of information technology has a significant positive influence on individual beliefs about the ease of use of a tech	√ tems: The I	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	Institutio	onal

H5: Higher levels of normative pressures lead to higher levels of top		✓	✓	1 1
management participation in the ERP assimilation process.  Liang, H., and Xue, Y. 2009. "Avoidance of Information Technology TI Perspective," MIS Quarterly (33:1), pp. 71-90.	hreats: A T	heoretic	al	
P1: Users' avoidance behavior under threat of malicious IT is a dynamic				
process that intends to enlarge the discrepancy between users' current		✓		
state and their undesired end state.		,		
P2: Users appraise how to cope with malicious IT only after they	_			
appraise the threat of malicious IT.	✓			
P3: Users may employ either problem-focused or emotion-focused				
coping to reduce the threat of malicious IT.	✓			
P3a: Users perform problem-focused coping to objectively mitigate the				
danger of	✓			
malicious IT, thus reducing the threat.	•			
P3b: Users perform emotion-focused coping to subjectively reduce the				
threat of malicious IT.	✓			
P4: Users' IT threat perception is determined by their perceived		,		
susceptibility and		√		
severity of malicious IT.				
P4a: The more users believe that they are susceptible to malicious IT,		✓		
the stronger their threat perception will be.				
P4b: The more users believe that the negative consequences caused by		√		
malicious IT are severe, the stronger their threat perception will be.				
P4c: Perceived severity and susceptibility have a positive interaction				1 1
effect on perceived threat. The boundary condition of this interaction is	✓			
that if either variable takes a value of zero, the other will have no	•			
relationship with perceived threat.				
P5: A safeguarding measure's effectiveness, costs, and users' self-				
efficacy toward it influence users' perceptions of avoidability of the IT	✓			
threat.				
P5a: Users are more likely to perceive an IT threat as avoidable by				
taking a safeguarding measure when this measure can effectively		✓		
reduce the IT threat.				
P5b: Users are more likely to perceive an IT threat as avoidable by				
taking a safeguarding measure when the costs associated with this	✓			
measure decrease.	•			
P5c: Users are more likely to perceive an IT threat as avoidable by				
taking a safeguarding measure when they feel confident in taking this		✓		
measure.		<b>v</b>		
P6: Users who perceive the threat of malicious IT will be motivated to	,			
avoid the threat by employing safeguarding measures and/or perform	<b>v</b>			
emotion-focused coping.				
P7: Users who perceive an IT threat to be avoidable will be motivated to				
take safeguarding measures and less likely perform emotion-focused	✓			
coping. In contrast, users who perceive an IT threat to be unavoidable	,			
will likely perform emotion-focused coping.				
P8: The relationship between perceived threat and avoidance motivation				
is a convex curve so that it becomes weaker as perceived threat	✓			
increases.				
P9: The relationship between perceived avoidability and avoidance				
motivation is negatively moderated by perceived threat so that it is				1 1
weaker when perceived threat increases. The boundary condition is that				
if perceived threat is zero, there	✓			1
would be no relationship between perceived avoidability and avoidance				
motivation.				
P10: Users' avoidance motivation leads to their avoidance behavior,				
which is taking safeguarding measures to reduce the IT threat.		✓		
P11: Users' risk tolerance negatively influences their perception of IT			-	
		✓		
threat.				
P12: Social influence affects users' evaluation of IT threats and		✓	✓	
safeguarding measures as well as their motivation to avoid IT threats.			·	إ
Lilien, G. L. Rangaswamy, A., Van Bruggen, G. H., and Starke, K. 2004				
Resource Allocation Decisions: Reality vs. Perception," Information S	Systems R	esearch	(15:3), p	р. 216-
235.				
H1: Model-based DSSs will improve objective decision outcomes				
relative to the Excel-only tool.				√
H1a: DSSs will generate more incremental returns/profits relative to the				<del>                                     </del>
Excel-only tool.				√
H1b: DSSs will result in more favorable experts' evaluation of the			1	+ - 1
decisions relative to the Excel-only tool.				✓
H2: DSSs will have no effect on the subjective evaluation of the decision			1	<del>   </del>
outcomes relative to the Excel-only tool.	✓			1 1
outouries relative to the Excertifly tool.		<b>-</b>	<b>!</b>	1

relative to the Excel-only tool.			
H3: DSSs will have mixed effects on the decision process.	√		
H3a: DSSs will lead to less effort devoted to problem solving than the excel-only tool.			✓
H3b: DSSs will enhance the quality of the discussions as compared to the Excel-only tool.			√
H3c: DSSs will lead to fewer decision alternative generated than the Excel-only tool.			✓
H4: DSSs will have mixed effects on the subjective evaluation of the decision process.	√		
H4a: DSSs will have no effect on perceived problem complexity relative to the Excel-only tool.			✓
H4b: DSSs will lead to less perceived learning relative to the Excel-only cool.			✓
H4c: DSSs will be perceived as useful relative to the Excel-only tool.			✓
Lim, K. H., Benbast, I., and Ward, L. M. 2000. "The Role of Multimedia	in Changi	ing First II	mpression
Bias," Information Systems Research (11:2), pp. 115-136.		1 1	
H1: A multimedia system will reduce the influence of first impression more than a text-based system.	√		
H2: A multimedia system will lead to a higher level of confidence with the decision made than will a text-based system.		✓	√
Lowry, P. B., Zhang, J., Wang, C., and Siponen, M. 2016. "Why Do Ad Social Media? An integration of Online Dis-inhibition and Deindividua Structure and Social Learning Model," <i>Information Systems Researc</i> a	ation Effec	ts with th	e Social
H1: An increase in anonymity is associated with increased cyberbullying NSI.	(=:::), [2]	√	
H2: An increase in anonymity is associated with decreased cyberbullying costs.		✓	
H3: An increase in anonymity is associated with increased cyberbullying penefits.		✓	
H4: An increase in anonymity is associated with increased cyberbullying neutralization.		✓	
H5: An increase in anonymity is associated with decreased cyberbullying situational morality.		✓	
H6: An increase in cyberbullying NSI is associated with increased cyberbullying.		✓	
H7a: An increase in cyberbullying benefits is associated with increased		✓	
cyberbullying.  H7b: An increase in cyberbullying costs is associated with decreased		✓	
cyberbullying.  H8a: An increase in cyberbullying neutralization is associated with		√	
increased cyberbullying.  H8b: An increase in situational morality is associated with decreased		<b>√</b>	
cyberbullying. Majchrzak, A., Rice, R. E., Malhotra, A., King, N., and Ba, S. 2000. "Te		<u>                                     </u>	
a Computer-Supported Inter-Organizational Virtual Team," MIS Quart	erly (24:4)	, pp. 569-6	600.
RQ1: Can the workgroup adapt any or all structures, or does it primarily try to adapt to the technology's initial spirit?	✓		
RQ2: Do pre-existing structures constrain the workgroup's adaptation process, even when these structures are malleable?		✓	
RQ3: After the initial adaptation to achieve alignment, does the workgroup experience the need for further adaptations?	✓		
RQ4: What is the nature of these adaptations: are they discontinuous, responding to windows of opportunities, or are they continuous,	✓		
gradually closing misalignments?			
Majchrzak, A., Beath, C. M., Lim, R. A., and Chin, W. W. 2005a. "Mana Information Systems Design to Facilitate Client Learning," <i>MIS Quart</i>			
H1: A team's use of collaboration elaboration (CE) would be related to ncreased client learning, after controlling for cooperative		✓	
nterdependence. (p. 658) H2: Client learning would be related to superior IS design outcomes,		<b>√</b>	
after controlling for developers' communication quality. (p. 658)  NOTE: The authors did not present their research hypotheses explicitly. To		tements a	
from their paper. The basic proposition of the research is as follows: "The experienced during the IS design phase of an IS development project, the			
greater the client learning, the more positive the IS design-phase outcome Majchrzak, A., Malhotra, A., and John, R. 2005b. "Perceived Individua	s."		
, ,			
Development Through Information Technology–Enabled Contextualize	Lation. Evi		
	√ V		<u> </u>

development and their perceptions of the degree of support provided by				
IT for their contextualization needs. There is a curvilinear relationship between the development of collaboration know-how and the perceived				
degree of contextualization support provided by the IT system for				
individuals engaged in routine tasks in distributed teams.				
Malhotra, N. K., Kim, S. S., and Agarwal, J. 2004. "Internet Users' Info				000
(IUIPC): The Construct, the Scale, and a Causal Model," <i>Information</i> 355.	Systems R	esearcn	(15:4), pp	. 336-
H1: Internet users' information privacy concerns will have a negative		,		
effect on trusting beliefs.		√		
H2: Internet users' information privacy concerns will have a positive		✓		
effect on risk beliefs.  H3: Trusting beliefs will have a negative effect on risk beliefs.		✓		
H4: Trusting beliefs will have a positive effect on intention to reveal				
personal information.		✓		
H5: Risk beliefs will have a negative effect on intention to reveal		<b>~</b>		
personal information.  H6: A marketer's request for more sensitive information will have a		·		
negative effect on trusting beliefs.		✓		
H7: A marketer's request for more sensitive information will have a		<b>√</b>		
positive effect on risk beliefs.		<b>'</b>		
H8: A marketer's request for more sensitive information will have a negative effect on intention to reveal personal information.		✓		
Malhotra, A., Gosain, S., and El Sawy, O. A. 2005. "Absorptive Capaci	ity Configu	rations i	n Supply	
Chains: Gearing for Partner-enabled Market Knowledge Creation," M				
P1: Enterprises engaged in collector type partnerships will	•	, ,,		
P1a: Attain limited knowledge creation potential due to a lack of joint				
decision-making activities with their partner, which inhibits their ability to	✓			
acquire and assimilate information that is of high quality and privileged in nature.				
P1b: Be able to acquire a broad range of information aided by standard				
electronic business interfaces, but lack the capability (information	✓			
systems for information interpretation) to transform the information	,			
exchanged to create operational efficiency and new knowledge.  P1c: Exchange higher amounts of coordination information due to a lack				
of modular organization of processes interlinked with their partner,	,			
potentially overwhelming their capability to assimilate and transform	✓			
more value-added information.				
P2: Enterprises engaged in connector type partnerships will P2a: Have a low ability to create market knowledge, even though they	I .			
have well-developed capabilities to acquire information, due to minimal				
capacity to assimilate and transform information resulting from the low	✓			
level of development and utilization of partner interface-directed				
information systems.  P2b: Achieve high operational efficiency through modular design of their				
interlinked processes, resulting in the reduced need for coordination	✓			
information exchange.				
P3: Enterprises engaged in cruncher type partnerships	1			
P3a: Exchange a narrow range of information that is not privileged in nature and exhibit moderate acquisition and assimilation capacities due	✓			
to a lack of well-developed integrative process mechanisms.	<b>'</b>			
P3b: Are only able to create a moderate level of market knowledge from				
high quality information exchanged with partners due to moderate				
acquisition and assimilation capacities, even though their well- developed information systems capabilities enable high transformation	✓			
capacity.				
P4: Enterprises engaged in coercive type partnerships achieve operational	l efficiency	and mark	ket-related	t
knowledge creation through mandated information sharing dictates, based				
between the two partners. However, in the long term, coercive type partne potential deleterious effects.	erships may	be unsta	ible due to	)
P4a: The coerced partners may refuse to adopt new interface formats or				
invest in new information sharing systems in the future, thereby	✓			
impeding the development of coercing enterprises' assimilation	•			
Capacity.				
P4b: The coercing enterprises may suffer from a progressive reduction in their assimilation capacity, because they do not collaborate				
intensively through joint decision making activities, engaging only in a	✓			
limited range of information exchange with specific partners.				
P5: Enterprises engaged in collaborator type partnerships will achieve high	h operation	al efficier	icy and	
knowledge creation by P5a: Creating high absorptive capacity (acquisition, assimilation, and	ſ			
transformation) through the development of inter-organizational	'			
				1

integrative process mechanisms as well as the complementary partner		Ī		
interface-directed information systems.			ļ	
P5b: Using joint decision making to exchange privileged information and signal collaborative intent, as well as using standard interfaces to	√			
reduce information processing needs.	•			
McKeen, J. D., Guimaraes, T., and Wetherbe, J. C. 1994. "The Relation	nship betw	een Use	r Particip	ation
and User Satisfaction: an Investigation of Four Contingency Factors,				
H1: A positive relationship exists between user participation and user		✓		
satisfaction.				
H2: The greater the task complexity, the greater the relationship		✓		
between user participation and user satisfaction.				
H3: The greater the system complexity, the greater the relationship between user participation and user satisfaction.		✓		
H4: The greater the user influence, the greater the relationship between				
user participation and user satisfaction.		√		
H5: The greater the quality of user-developer communication, the		,		
greater the relationship between user participation and user satisfaction.		✓		
Melville, N., Kraemer, K., and Gurbaxani, V. 2004. "Review: Information				tional
Performance: An Integrative Model of IT business Value," MIS Quarte	rly (28:2),	pp. 283-	322.	
P1a: The IT resource including both technology and human expertise				
creates economic value for a focal firm by conferring operational				✓
efficiencies that vary in magnitude and type depending upon the				
organizational and technological context.  P1b: Human IT expertise complementary to technological IT resources		<del>                                     </del>	<del>                                     </del>	
may create temporary competitive advantages that underlie	√			
performance differences among firms.	•			
P2a: Certain organizational resources are complementary to the IT				
resource in the generation of IT business value for the focal firm; the				
existence and magnitude of the complementarity between any two	√			
specific instantiations of these resources varies depending upon the				
organizational and technological contexts.				
P2b: The greater the inimitability of rare organizational resources that				
are complementary to IT and lacking substitutes, the greater the degree		√		
to which the focal firm can obtain a sustained competitive advantage.			1	
P3a: Industry characteristics moderate the ability of firms to apply IT for improved organizational performance and to capture the resulting		✓		
benefits.		<b>'</b>		
P3b: The greater the degree of competition in an industry, the greater			1	
the extent to which firms achieve efficiency gains via IT.				✓
P3c: The greater the degree of competition in an industry, the lower the				
extent to which firms are able to capture the benefits of efficiency gains	✓			
and achieve profitability gains via IT.				
P4a: The IT and non-IT resources and the business processes of				
electronically connected trading partners shape the focal firms ability to		✓		
generate and capture organizational performance impacts via IT.				
P4b: The greater the degree of focal firm power relative to its trading		<b>l</b> ,		
partners connected via inter-organizational information systems, the		√		
greater its share of net value from deployment of the systems.				
P5a: The macro environment shapes the degree to which firms can apply IT for organizational improvement.	✓			
P5b: Telecommunications infrastructure a complementary and			<del>                                     </del>	
potentially co-specialized asset with the IT resource moderates the				
economic value of an inter-organizational information system to the	✓			
ocal firm and its trading partners; the extent of moderation varies	,			
depending on the organizational and technological context.				
Nissen, M. E., and Sengupta, K. 2006. "Incorporating Software Agents	s into Sup	oly Chair	ns:	
Experimental Investigation with a Procurement Task," MIS Quarterly	(30:1), pp.	145-166		
H1a: [in tasks with low specification ambiguity] The use of information				
retrieval agents will result in higher quality procurement choices than		√		✓
hose made manually (i.e., higher procurement economy and accuracy).				
H1b: [in tasks with low specification ambiguity] The use of advisory		,		,
agents will result in higher quality procurement choices than those made		✓		✓
manually (i.e., higher procurement economy and accuracy).  H1c: [in tasks with low specification ambiguity] The use of performative				
agents will result in higher quality procurement choices than those made		✓		√
nanually (i.e., higher procurement economy and accuracy).		I *		•
H1d: [in tasks with low specification ambiguity] The use of performative		<b>-</b>	1	
agents will result in higher quality procurement choices than those		l .		_
supported by either information retrieval or advisory agents (i.e., higher		√		✓
procurement economy and accuracy).				
H2a: [in tasks with moderate specification ambiguity] The use of		✓	1	✓
in tacks with incactate opcomeation ambiguity; the acc of		•		
information retrieval agents will result in higher quality procurement				

choices than those made manually (i.e., higher procurement economy			l I	Ī
and accuracy).				
H2b: [in tasks with moderate specification ambiguity] The use of				
advisory agents will result in higher quality procurement choices than		√		✓
those made manually (i.e., higher procurement economy and accuracy).				
H2c: [in tasks with moderate specification ambiguity] The use of				
performative agents will result in higher quality procurement choices		✓		✓
than those made manually (i.e., higher procurement economy and				·
accuracy).				
H2d: [in tasks with moderate specification ambiguity] The use of				
performative agents will result in higher quality procurement choices		√		✓
than those supported by either information retrieval or advisory agents				
(i.e., higher procurement economy and accuracy).				
H3a: [in tasks with high specification ambiguity] The use of information	,			
retrieval agents will result in lower quality procurement choices than	√			
those made manually (i.e., lower procurement economy and accuracy).				
H3b: [in tasks with high specification ambiguity] The use of advisory	,			
agents will result in lower quality procurement choices than those made	√			
manually (i.e., lower procurement economy and accuracy).				
H3c: [in tasks with high specification ambiguity] The use of performative	,			
agents will result in lower quality procurement choices than those made	√			
manually (i.e., lower procurement economy and accuracy).				
H3d: [in tasks with high specification ambiguity] The use of performative				
agents will result in lower quality procurement choices than those	✓			
supported by either information retrieval or advisory agents (i.e., lower				
procurement economy and accuracy).				
Pavlou, P. A., and Gefen, D. 2004. "Building Effective Online Market-	places with	n Institut	tion-Base	d
Trust," Information Systems Research (15:1), pp. 37-59.	•			
H1a: The perceived effectiveness of the feedback mechanism increases		√		✓
buyer trust in the community of sellers.		*		•
H1b: The perceived effectiveness of the feedback mechanism reduces		√		✓
buyers' perceived risk of transacting with the community of sellers.		,		•
H2a: The perceived effectiveness of escrow services increases buyer		✓		✓
trust in the community (not negated) of sellers.		٧		•
H2b: The perceived effectiveness of escrow services reduces buyer		✓		✓
perceived risk of transacting with the community of sellers.		*		•
H3a: The perceived effectiveness of credit card guarantees increases		✓		✓
buyer trust in the community of sellers.		٧		•
H3b: The perceived effectiveness of credit card guarantees reduces		<b>√</b>		✓
buyer perception of risk of transacting with the community of sellers.		٧		٧
H4a: Trust in the intermediary increases buyer trust in the community of		,		,
sellers.		✓		√
H4b: Trust in the intermediary reduces buyer perceived risk of		,		,
transacting with the community of sellers.		√		✓
H5: Trust in the community of sellers reduces the perceived risk of		,		
transacting with sellers in online marketplaces.		√		✓
H6: Trust in the community of sellers increases buyer intentions to			1	_
transact with sellers in the specific online marketplace.		√		✓
H7: Perceived risk in the community of sellers decreases intentions to			1	
transact with sellers in an online marketplace.		√		
H8: Buyer intentions to transact with sellers in an online marketplace are				
positively related to transaction behavior.		√		
Pavlou, P. A., and Gefen, D. 2005. "Psychological Contract Violation	in Onlina M	larkotni.	COS.	
Antecedents, Consequences, and Moderating Role," <i>Information Sys</i>				72-
399.		511 (10	,, pp. 01	-
H1: Psychological contact violation due to an individual seller in a			<u> </u>	
positively influences Psychological Contract Violation with the entire with	✓			
the entire community of sellers in the online marketplace.				
H2: Psychological Contract Violation with the community of sellers			1	
decreases a buyer's trust in the community of sellers.		✓		
H3: Psychological Contract Violation with the community of sellers			<del>                                     </del>	
increases a buyer's perceived risk from transacting with the community		✓		
of sellers.		'		
			1	
H4: Psychological Contract Violation with the community of sellers		✓		
reduces buyers' intentions to transact with the community of sellers.			<del>                                     </del>	
H5: Psychological Contract Violation with the community of sellers		✓		
results in lower price premiums for an identical product.				
H6: Transaction intentions increase a buyer's actual transaction		✓		
behavior with the community of sellers.				
H7a: Price premiums increase a buyer's actual transaction behavior with	√			
the community of sellers.	•		Ī	
H7b: Higher transaction intentions result in higher price premiums for an		✓		

	<b>√</b>		
	✓	1	
			1 1
		ĺ	
	✓	ĺ	
		<b></b>	
		ĺ	
	✓	i	
		i	
	✓	i	
		i	
	✓	i	
		i	
	✓	i	
	✓	i	
ng Uncer	tainty in	Online	
	<b>√</b>	√ 	
	lacksquare	<u> </u>	+
	,	,	
	1	<b>'</b>	
-			-
	✓	✓	
	✓	i	
	ſ		
✓		i	
		<del> </del>	
✓		i	
		<del></del>	
	,	<del></del>	<del>                                     </del>
		<del></del>	
		<del></del>	<del>                                     </del>
	<b>-</b>		
	✓	i	✓
	✓	ĺ	√
	<b>*</b>	<u> </u>	✓
	1		<b>√</b>
		<u> </u>	
	✓	<b>√</b>	
		<u> </u>	
	✓	✓	
		<del></del>	_
	-	<del>                                     </del>	<del>                                     </del>
•	tion Proc	000000	luring
iiiu Attell	MON PIOC	, <del>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</del>	uring
		ſ	<del>T  </del>
✓		1	
			<del>                                     </del>
✓		1	
✓		1	
✓		1	
		<u> </u>	الب
s of Digita	ally Enab	led Sup	ply
	· / ¬		/
	✓ ✓ ✓ And Atten ✓ ✓ ✓	### ##################################	The state of the s

Integration ("IT infrastructure integration is conceptualized as a formative construct with two sub-constructs: data consistency and cross-functional SCM application systems integration." p. 231)				
H1a: Data consistency => IT Infrastructure Integration for SCM ("Data consistency in supply chainsshould enable process integration including the integration of information, financial, and physical flows." p. 231)		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
H1b: Cross-functional application integration => IT Infrastructure Integration for SCM ("We consider integration of applications for supply chain planning and execution, and their integration with ERP and CRM systems; together they characterize the applications infrastructure for end-to-end management of supply chainsFinally, integrated supply chain, ERP, and CRM applications should facilitate the coordination of supplier- and customer-facing processes with internal firm processes." p. 232)		<b>√</b>		<b>√</b>
H2: Supply Chain Process Integration => Firm Performance ("We examine whether aggregate performance of a firm, as assessed by operations excellence, revenue growth, and customer relationships, is influenced by supply chain process integration." p. 230), ("supply chain process integration is conceptualized as a formative construct with three sub-constructs: information flow integration, physical flow integration, and financial flow integration" p. 230)		✓		<b>~</b>
H2a: Information flow integration => Supply Chain Process Integration ("By improving the precision of demand estimation through collaborative forecasting, and facilitating supply and demand alignment, information sharing can strengthen bonds with customers and generate increased revenues from existing products and new products and markets (Anderson et al. 1994; Mohr and Nevin 1990)." p. 230)		✓		<b>√</b>
H2b: Physical flow integration => Supply Chain Process Integration ("By increasing responsiveness to customer demand through strategies such as postponement of differentiation (Feitzinger and Lee 1997) physical flow integration can improve customer relationships and customer service (Ellingeretal. 1999; Gustinetal. 1995). Finally, such integration is expected to improve long-term competitiveness and growth (Goldhar and Lei 1991)." p. 231)		1		✓
H2c: Financial flow integration => Supply Chain Process Integration ("Financial flow integration can impact revenue growth by improving cash flow availability for production ramp-up when demand swings upward, or for exploration of new product lines." p. 231)		1		<b>√</b>
H3a: Operational excellence => Firm performance		<b>√</b>		✓
H3b: Customer excellence => Firm performance		√		✓
H3c: Revenue excellence => Firm performance ("Operations excellence, revenue growth, and customer relationships, recognized as important dimensions of firm performance (Slywotzky et al. 2000), are three aspects of performance that we consider." p. 229)		✓		✓
NOTE: The authors did not present their research hypotheses explicitly. T derived from Figure 2 of their paper.	he hypothe	ses prese	ented here	e are
Ray, G., Muhanna, W. A., and Barney, J. B. 2005. "Information Technology	ology and t	he Perfo	rmance	of the
Customer Service Process: A Resource-Based Analysis," MIS Quarte	erly (29:4),	pp. 625-	652.	
H1a: Technical IT skills will not explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	✓			
H1b: Generic information technologies used to support the customer service process will not explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	✓			
H1c: The level of IT spending will not explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	<b>√</b>			
H2a: The level of shared knowledge will explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	<b>√</b>			
H2b: The flexibility of IT infrastructure will explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	✓			
H3a: Technical IT skills, in the presence of a high level of shared knowledge, will explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	<b>~</b>			
H3b: Generic information technologies used to support the customer service process, in the presence of a high level of shared knowledge, will explain variance in the performance of the customer service process across firms in the North American insurance industry.	✓			
Salaway, G. 1987. "An Organizational learning Approach to Informati	on System	s Develo	pment,"	MIS

Quarterly (11:2), pp. 245-265.  Traditional interactions display primarily:				
H1: Model 1 causal thinking patterns => Current user/analyst causal thinking is predominantly Model 1 (In Model 1, problems and situations are most often identified as caused by another person and/or the external environment. There is little identification of how one's own behavior may be problematic or impact the situation in a negative way. Model 2 calls for intentional evaluation of how one's own thoughts and actions impact situations, so that one can generate new, more effective actions.)	1			
H2: Model 1 strategic thinking patterns => Current user/analyst strategic thinking is predominantly Model 1 (Model 1 strategies identify what must happen in the environment or what one must do unilaterally to ensure that one's own goals are satisfied. In Model 2 strategic thinking, Attention is focused on what must happen to resolve goal incompatibilities and satisfy other's as well as ones own goals.)	✓			
H3: Advocacy rather than inquiry patterns => Advocacy (to support publicly, defend a position, idea or action) characterizes most of the verbal action most people produce most of the time	<b>√</b>			
H4: Model 1 advocacy patterns not including specifics or data => The form of Model 1 advocacy is to publicly state a position without giving data (something that can be seen, heard, or touched in a straightforward way), or specific examples that can be disconfirmed (H4)	<b>4</b>			
H5: Model 1 advocacy patterns not including specifics, data or inquiry => The form of Model 1 advocacy is to publicly state a position without giving data (something that can be seen, heard, or touched in a straightforward way), or specific examples that can be disconfirmed and without inviting inquiry to test the validity of the position.	1			
H6: Model 1 inquiry patterns (loaded and inferential inquiry) => A strategy of unilateral control implies that inquiry be presented in such a way that the answers are implied in the question so that they are more likely to agree with the predetermined answers in the mind of the inquirer.	<b>√</b>			
H7: Model 2 error-detecting inquiry patterns that generate new information rather than disconfirm existing information => Where error-detecting inquiry is used, it will be used to gather information, rather than actually test existing information for errors.	1			
H8: Model 1 confrontability patterns about negative impacts => In Model 1, confrontability is done by confronting another person's actions, ideas or feelings. Confronting others by challenging the validity of their positions tends to elicit a defensive response and keep important information from being volunteered.	✓			
H9: Model 1 confrontability patterns about requests => Requesting information or action from another person can also be done in either a confronting or nonconfronting manner. A Model 1 approach makes demands of others.	1			
H10: Model 1 discussability patterns.	√			
H11: Topics discussed that are not interpersonal.	√			
Quote from the paper: "A steady flow of thoughts, feelings, theories, assurmanifest in one's actions both directly and indirectly. In Model 1, the unilat such thoughts to be kept private (H10), especially those of an interpersonal H12: Percentage of Model 2 advocacy patterns (includes both data and inquiry)	eral control	strategy		
H13: Percentage of advocacy patterns with specifics	<b>√</b>			
H14: Percentage of advocacy patterns with data	√ ·	<u> </u>		
Quote from the paper: "In Model 2, advocacy is backed up by directly obsespecific example (H13) that can be disconfirmed, as well as inquiry design	ed to test t			
H15: Percentage of inquiry patterns H16: Percentage of Model 2 inquiry patterns (open ended, grounded in	<b>√</b>			
data, and testing inquiry)	✓			
H17: Percentage of Model 2 inquiry patterns for testing (testing inquiry)	√	<u>L</u>		
Quote from the paper: "In Model 2, the use of inquiry is intentionally increase open inquiry to discover the meanings attributed to actions, inferences, as rather than to reinforce ideas already established (H17)."				
H18: Percentage of Model 2 confrontability patterns about negative impact (make self confrontable) => One way of generating more valid information (although much more difficult) is to make oneself confrontable instead. This requires that one identify his or her own personal responsibility in the situation and discuss this publicly in order to create a less threatening environment for other people's responses.	1			
H19: Percentage of Model 2 confrontability patterns about requests	√			
(express preferences, giving choice) => Requesting information or				
-	-	-	- '	•

				-
action from another person can also be done in either a confronting or				
nonconfronting manner. In a Model 2 approach, one expresses preferences and ensures others the opportunity to suggest alternatives				
and make choices.				
H20: Percentage of interpersonal topics discussed => In Model 2, a				
conscious effort is made to identify such thoughts, feelings,				
assumptions, theories, etc. and state them publicly so they can be challenged by others. An increase in interpersonal topics should also	✓			
follow (H20). This allows theories to be frequently added, updated, or				
deleted, and facilitates creative, lasting solutions to problems.				
H21: Percentage of active confirmation patterns (confirming another	<b>√</b>			
person's advocacy giving data/specifics as proof)	<b>'</b>			
H22: Percentage of active disconfirmation patterns (disconfirming	√			
another person's advocacy giving data/specifics as proof) H23: Percentage of patterns directly continuing the topic just previously				
discussed	√			
Quote from the paper: "Model 2 theories of action increase the occurrence	of verbal r	atterns o	designed	to
continue addressing a relevant topic (H23) until ideas can be actively conf				
so that errors can be surfaced and corrected before systems installation."			_	_
H24: Percentage of advocacy patterns with specifics or data displayed				
by persons not trained in the organizational learning method => With	✓			
more questions asked by users and analysts practicing Model 2, others should be encouraged to provide more data and specific examples in	<b>'</b>			
response to such inquiry				
Sambamurthy, V., Bharadwaj, A., and Grover, V. 2003. "Shaping Firm	Agility thr	ough Di	gital Opt	ions:
Reconceptualizing the Role of IT in Contemporary Firms," MIS Quarte	erly (27:2),	pp. 237	-263.	•
P1: The impact of IT competence on digital options will be positively		✓		✓
moderated by the entrepreneurial alertness of the firm.  P2: The impact of digital options (i.e., process reach and richness and				1
knowledge reach and richness) on agility will be positively moderated by		✓		✓
entrepreneurial alertness.		,		`
P3: The impact of agility on the number of competitive actions and				
action repertoire complexity will be positively moderated by		✓		✓
entrepreneurial alertness.				
P4: Well-developed digital options (i.e., greater process reach and richness and greater knowledge reach and richness) will contribute to		√		✓
higher levels of IT competence.		`		'
P5: Well-developed digital options (i.e., greater process reach and				
richness and greater knowledge reach and richness) will contribute to		✓		✓
higher levels of entrepreneurial alertness.				
P6: Higher levels of agility will further enhance digital options.		√		✓
P7: Higher levels of agility will further enhance entrepreneurial		√		✓
P8: Greater number of competitive actions and action repertoire				
complexity will enhance agility.	✓			
P9: Greater number of competitive actions and action repertoire	,			
complexity will enhance entrepreneurial alertness.	✓			
Straub, D. and Welke, R. J. 1998. "Coping with Systems Risk: Securit	y Planning	Models	for	
Management Decision Making," MIS Quarterly (22:4), pp. 441-469.	T	T	1	1
P1: Managers are aware of only a fraction of the full spectrum of actions that can be taken to reduce systems risk.		✓		
P2: Managers exposed to theory-grounded security planning techniques				
will be inclined to employ these in their planning processes.		√		
Subramani, M. 2004. "How Do Suppliers Benefit from Information Tec	hnology L	Jse in Su	ipply Ch	ain
Relationships," MIS Quarterly (28:1), pp. 45-73.				
H1: The higher the level of SCMS use for exploitation, the greater the	√			
level of business-process specificity in the exchange.	,			
H2: The higher the level of SCMS use for exploration, the greater the level of domain-knowledge specificity in the exchange.	✓			
H3a: The association of IT Exploit [IT Exploitation] with business-				
process specificity is stronger than the association of IT Explore [IT	√			
Exploration] with business-process specificity.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	<u>L</u> _
H3b: The association of IT Explore with domain-knowledge specificity is				
stronger than the association of IT Exploit with domain-knowledge	√			
specificity.	<b></b>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>
H4 The higher the level of SCMS use for exploitation, the higher the levels of operational and strategic benefits achieved through the	<b>√</b>			
	<b>'</b>			
	<del>                                     </del>		1	
leverage of relationship-specific business processes.  H5: The higher the level of SCMS use for exploration, the higher the			Ī	1
leverage of relationship-specific business processes.  H5: The higher the level of SCMS use for exploration, the higher the levels of operational and strategic benefits achieved through the	✓			
leverage of relationship-specific business processes.  H5: The higher the level of SCMS use for exploration, the higher the	✓			

with higher levels of competitive performance.  H7: Higher levels of strategic benefits in the exchange are associated			
with higher levels of competitive performance.		✓	
Sussman, S. W., and Siegal, W. S. 2003. "Informational Influence in C			tegrated
Approach to Knowledge Adoption," <i>Information Systems Research</i> (H1: The higher the perceived argument quality of a message, the more	14:1), pp. 4		
useful the message will be perceived to be.		✓	
H2: The higher the perceived credibility of a message source, the more		✓	
useful the message will be perceived to be.  H3: Messages perceived to contain information of high usefulness will			
be associated with higher levels of information adoption than messages		✓	
perceived to contain information of low usefulness.			
H4: Usefulness will mediate the effects of source credibility on information adoption, and argument quality on information adoption.		✓	
H5a: The greater the recipient's expertise in the topic of the message,			
the more argument quality affects perceived message usefulness.		√	
H5b: The greater the recipient's expertise in the topic of the message, the less source credibility factors affect perceived message usefulness.		✓	
H6a: The greater the recipient's involvement in the topic of the			
message, the more argument quality affects perceived message		✓	
usefulness.			
H6b: The greater the recipient's involvement in the topic of the message, the less source credibility factors affect perceived message		✓	
usefulness.		·	
Tanriverdi, H. 2005. "Information Technology Relatedness, Knowledge		ment Cap	pability, and
Performance of Multibusiness Firms," MIS Quarterly (29: 2), pp. 311- H1: Complementarity of product KM capability, customer KM capability,	334. 		
and managerial KM capability has a positive effect on corporate		✓	✓
financial performance of a multi-business firm.			
H2: Complementarity of the four dimensions of IT relatedness is positively associated with cross-unit KM capability of a multi-business		✓	✓
firm.		•	· ·
Te'eni, D. 2001. "Review: A Cognitive-affective Model of Organization	nal Commu	nication	for Designing
IT," MIS Quarterly (25:2), pp. 251-312.	1	1	
P1: Beyond some minimal value of communication complexity, a reduction in it will result in higher levels of mutual understanding and	✓		
relationship.	·		
P2a: Contextualization is selected for communication goals	✓		
characterized by high cognitive complexity.  P2b: Affectivity is selected for communication goals characterized by			
high affective complexity.	✓		
P2c: Control by testing and adjusting is selected for communication			
goals characterized by high cognitive complexity coupled with high dynamic complexity.	✓		
P2d: Control by planning is selected for communication goals			
characterized by high cognitive complexity coupled with low dynamic	✓		
complexity.			
Corollary: Contextualization is selected over control when mutual understanding decreases.	✓		
P3a: For control by testing and adjusting, high, rather than low,	<b>√</b>		
interactivity is more effective.	٧		
P3b: For contextualization, high, rather than low, channel capacity is more effective.	✓		
P3c: For affectivity, high, rather than low, channel capacity is more	,		
effective.	√		
P3d: For perspective taking, high, rather than low, adaptiveness is more	✓		
effective. P4a: Senders will adapt to low channel capacity coupled with high			
interactivity by increasing control through testing and adjusting.	√		
P4b: Senders will adapt to low channel capacity coupled with low	✓		
interactivity by increasing control through planning.	<u>'</u>		
P4c: Senders will adapt to low channel capacity coupled with low interactivity by decreasing affectivity.	✓		<b> </b>
P4d: Senders will adapt to low channel capacity coupled with high	<b>√</b>		
interactivity by increasing affectivity.	<b>,</b>		
P5a: For affectivity, a small, rather than wide, distribution is more effective.	✓		<b> </b>
P5b: For contextualization, high, rather than low, message organization	<del>                                     </del>		<del>                                     </del>
is more effective.	√		
P5c: For control by planning, high, rather than low, message	✓		
organization is more effective. P5d: For affectivity, low, rather than high, formality is more effective.	<b>√</b>		<del>                                     </del>
i ou, i oi ancouvity, iow, rather than high, formality is more effective.	· •		

ffective.		<u> </u>		<u> </u>
5f: For contextualization, low, rather than high, formality is usually nore effective.	✓			
nore eπective.  6a: Senders will adapt to a long message by increasing attention	<u> </u>	<del> </del>		<del>                                     </del>
ocusing.	✓			
6b: Senders will adapt to low message organization by increasing				
ontrol through testing and adjusting, provided media interactivity is	√			
igh. 7a: When interactivity is high, senders will exchange shorter, rather				
nan longer, messages.	✓			
7b: When channel capacity is low, senders will exchange messages of	,			
igher, rather than lower, formality.	√			
8a: Higher task variety increases the frequency of requesting	✓			
offormation.				
8b: Lower task analyzability increases the use of contextualization. 8c: A short time-to-complete the task increases the use of control by	✓			
esting and adjusting.	✓			
8d: A very long time-to-complete the task increases the use of control	,			
y planning.	✓			
9a: Greater cognitive distance increases the use of contextualization.	✓			
9b: Greater cognitive distance increases the frequency of requesting	✓			
offormation.	<u> </u>	<b>_</b>		<u> </u>
9c: Greater affective distance reduces the frequency of requesting information.	✓			
10a: Individuals in interdependent cultures tend to engage in more				
equent communication for managing relationships, provided the	✓			
ffective and cognitive distance does not exceed some threshold.				
10b: Individuals in interdependent cultures tend to use more	✓			
erspective taking. eo, H. H., Wei, K. K., and Benbasat, I. 2003. "Predicting Intention to A		rorgani-	tions!	<u> </u>
eo, H. H., Wei, K. K., and Benbasat, I. 2003. "Predicting intention to A inkages: An Institutional Perspective," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (27:1), pp. 19-4		rorganiza	ationai	
11: Greater mimetic pressures will lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI	10.	Ι,	,	
inancial electronic data interchange].		✓	✓	
11a: Greater extent of adoption of FEDI among its competitors will lead		✓	1	
greater intent to adopt FEDI.		,		
I1b: Greater perceived success of competitors that have adopted FEDI vill lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI.		✓	✓	
12: Greater coercive pressures will lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI.		<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	
2a: Greater perceived dominance of its suppliers that have adopted				
EDI will lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI.		√	✓	
2b: Greater perceived dominance of its customers that have adopted		✓	1	
EDI will lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI.		•	· ·	
I2c: Adoption of FEDI by parent corporation will lead to greater intent to dopt FEDI.		✓	✓	
13: Greater normative pressures will lead to greater intent to adopt				
EDI.		√	✓	
3a: Greater extent of adoption of FEDI among its suppliers will lead to		✓	<b>√</b>	
reater intent to adopt.		<u> </u>		<u> </u>
3b: Greater extent of adoption of FEDI among its customers will lead		✓	✓	
o greater intent to adopt.  13c: Participation in associations that promote and disseminate	<b> </b>	}		<b>-</b>
nformation on FEDI will lead to greater intent to adopt FEDI.		✓	✓	
14: Mimetic pressures will have a more significant impact on intention to		<b>√</b>		
dopt FEDI when perceived complexity is higher than when it is lower.				
ance, A., Lowry, P. B., Eggett, D. 2015. "A New Approach to the Prol				
ncreasing Perceptions of Accountability Through the User Interface,	," MIS Qua	arterly (39	):2), pp. 3	345–
66.  11: UI artifacts that manipulate identifiability will increase accountability.		✓		<b>√</b>
12: UI artifacts that manipulate expectation of evaluation will increase	<del>                                     </del>			
ccountability.		✓		✓
3: UI artifacts that manipulate awareness of monitoring will increase		.,		,
ccountability.	<u> </u>	✓		√
4: UI artifacts that manipulate social presence will increase	I	✓		1
ccountability.	<b></b>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>
I5: UI artifacts that manipulate accountability mechanisms will increase ccountability.		✓		✓
l6: Perceived accountability decreases intention to commit access-		<u> </u>		
olicy violations.		✓		
17: Accountability will mediate the effects of UI artifacts for (1)		✓		
dentifiability, (2) expectation of evaluation, (3) awareness of monitoring,	_	-		

intention to commit access-policy violations.				
van der Heijden, H. 2004. "User Acceptance of Hedonic Information \$ 695-704	Systems,"	MIS Qua	arterly (28	3:4), pp
H1: For hedonic systems, perceived enjoyment is a stronger predicator of behavioral intention to use than perceived usefulness.		✓		
H2: For hedonic systems, perceived ease of use is a stronger predicator		✓		
of behavioral intention to use than perceived usefulness.  Venkatesh, V. and Morris, M. G. 2000. "Why Don't Men ever Stop to A	Ask for Dire	ections?	Gender.	Social
Influence, and their Role in Technology Acceptance and Usage Beha 115-139.				
H1: Perceived usefulness will influence behavioral intention to use a	Ι,	I		Ī
system more strongly for men than it will influence women.	√			
H2a: Perceived ease of use will influence behavioral intention to use a system more strongly for women than it will influence men.	✓			
H2b: Perceived ease of use will influence perceived usefulness more	<b>√</b>			
strongly for men than it will influence women.  H3: Subjective norm will influence behavioral intention to use a system				
more strongly for women than it will influence men.	✓			
H4: With increasing direct experience with the technology, perceived usefulness will influence behavioral intention to use a system more	<b>√</b>			
strongly for men than it will influence women.	•			
H5a: With increasing direct experience with the technology, perceived				
ease of use will influence behavioral intention to use a system more strongly for women than it will influence men.	✓			
H5b: With increasing direct experience with the technology, perceived				
ease of use will influence perceived usefulness more strongly for men than it will influence women.	✓			
H6: With increasing direct experience with the technology, subjective	_		1	1
norm will not influence behavioral intention to use a system for either women or men.	✓			
Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., and Davis, F. D. 2003. "Use		nce of In	formatio	n
Technology: Toward a Unified View," MIS Quarterly (27:3), pp. 425-43	78.	1	ı	1
H1. The influence of performance expectancy on behavioral intention will be moderated by gender and age, such that the effect will be	✓			
stronger for men and particularly for younger men.				
H2.The influence of effort expectancy on behavioral intention will be moderated by gender, age, and experience, such that the effect will be				
stronger for women, particularly younger women, and particularly at	✓			
early stages of experience.				
H3. The influence of social influence on behavioral intention will be moderated by gender, age, voluntariness, and experience, such that the				
effect will be stronger for women, particularly older women, particularly	<b>√</b>			
in mandatory settings in the early stages of experience.  H4a. Facilitating conditions will not have a significant influence on				
behavioral intention.	√			
H4b. The influence of facilitating conditions on usage will be moderated	,			
by age and experience, such that the effect will be stronger for older workers, particularly will increasing experience.	✓			
H5a. Computer self-efficacy will not have a significant influence on	✓			
behavioral intention.  H5b: Compute anxiety will not have a significant influence on behavioral				
intention.	✓			
H5c: Attitude toward using technology will not have a significant influence on behavioral intention.	✓			
H6. Behavioral intention will have a significant positive influence on		✓		
usage.	f lf		1 - 141 11	
Vessey, I., and Galleta, D. 1991. "Cognitive Fit: An Empirical Study of Information Systems Research (2:1), pp. 63-84.	Tintormatio	on Acqu	isition,"	
P1: More effective and efficient problem solving results when the		✓		
problem representation matches the task to be accomplished.  P2: Problem-solving performance is improved when problem-solving		<u> </u>		-
skills match both problem representation and task, or either the problem				1
representation or the task. Problem-solving performance is improved		√	1	
more if the skills match both the problem representation and the task, rather than matching only the problem representation or the task.				
P3: Problem solvers formulate a mental representation of the problem				1
consistent with the type of information in the first problem-solving element examined.	✓			
P4: The problem representation has a greater effect than task type on	<b>\</b>			1
the mental representation formulated.	√		1	
P5: Symbolic problem-solving elements (problem representation and	√			1

Wasko, M. M., and Faraj, S. 2005. "Why Should I Share? Examining S	ocial Cani	ital and K	nowleda	e
Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice," MIS Quarterly (20:1			ow.cag	•
H1a: Individuals who perceive that participation will enhance their	,, pp. 00 0	Ī		
reparations in the profession will contribute more helpful responses to		✓		
electronic networks of practice.				
H1b: Individuals who perceive that participation will enhance their				
reputations in the profession will contribute more responses to electronic		✓		
networks of practice.				
H2a: Individuals who enjoy helping others will contribute more helpful		,		
responses to electronic networks of practice.		√		
H2b: Individuals who enjoy helping others will contribute more		,		
esponses to electronic networks of practice.		√		
13a: Individuals with higher levels of network centrality will contribute		√		
nore helpful responses to electronic networks of practice.		٧		
H3b: Individuals with higher levels of network centrality will contribute		√		
nore responses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H4a: Individuals with higher levels of expertise in the shared practice will				
contribute more helpful practice will contribute more helpful responses		✓		
o electronic networks of practice.				
H4b: Individuals with higher levels of expertise in the shared practice will		✓		
contribute more responses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H5a: Individuals with longer tenure in the shared practice will contribute		✓		
nore helpful responses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H5b: Individuals with longer tenure in the shared practice will contribute	✓			
more responses to electronic networks of practice.	٧			
H6a: Individuals who are committed to the network will contribute more		✓		
nelpful responses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H6b: Individuals who are committed to the network will contribute more		✓		
esponses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H7a: Individuals guided by a norm by reciprocity will contribute more		√		
nelpful responses to electronic networks of practice.		•		
H7b: Individuals guided by a norm of reciprocity will contribute more		<b>√</b>		
responses to electronic networks of practice.		v		
Watson, R. T. 1990. "Influences on the IS Manager's Perceptions of K	ey Issues	Informat	ion Scan	ning
and the Relationship with the CEO," MIS Quarterly (14:2), pp. 217-231				
P1: The scanning behavior of an IS manager will influence his or her		✓		
udgment of key issues.		•		
P2: The relationship of an IS manager to the CEO will influence the IS		./		
manager's judgment of key issues.		✓		
Weill, P. 1992. "The Relationship between Investment in Information	Technolog	y and Fi	m	
Performance: a Study of the Valve Manufacturing Sector," <i>Informatio</i>	n System	s Researd	ch (3:4), <sub> </sub>	op.
307-333.				
H1: There is no association between previous years' total investment in	✓			
T and the firm's incremental performance.	٧			
H2: There is a positive association between previous years' investment				
n IT, categorized by management objective, and the firm's incremental				
performance. Transactional IT is posited to affect profitability and labor		✓		√
productivity of the firm. Strategic and informational IT are posited to				
affect the growth and profit aspects of firm performance, respectively.				
H3: There is a positive association between incremental IT investment,				
categorized by management objective, and each measure of previous	√			
vear's firm performance.				
H4: Conversion effectiveness moderates any relationship between IT				
nvestment, categorized by management objective, and incremental firm	✓			
performance.				
Nixom, B. H. and Todd, P. A. 2005. "A Theoretical Integration of User	Satisfact	ion and T	echnolog	gy
Acceptance," Information Systems Research (16:1), pp. 85-102.				
H1a: Information quality is affected by completeness.		√		
H1b: Information quality is affected by accuracy.		√		
H1c: Information quality is affected by format.		√ ·		
H1d: Information quality is affected by currency.		<b>→</b>		
H2a: System quality is affected by reliability.				
		<b>√</b>		
H2b: System quality is affected by flexibility.		✓		
H2c: System quality is affected by integration.		✓		
H2d: System quality is affected by accessibility.		✓		
H2e: System quality is affected by timeliness.		√		
H3: Information quality has a positive effect on information satisfaction.		√		
14: System quality has a positive effect on system satisfaction.		<b>√</b>		
	-	1 '		
H5: System satisfaction has a positive relationship with information	✓			

H6: Information satisfaction increases perceptions of usefulness.		√	
7: System satisfaction has a positive effect on ease of use.		✓	
H8: Ease of use has a positive relationship with perception of	✓		
usefulness.			
H9: Usefulness forms a positive attitude to toward using.		<b>√</b>	
H10: Usefulness increases intention to adopt.		<b>√</b>	
H11: Ease of use forms a positive attitude toward using.		✓	
H12: Attitude toward using has a positive relationship with intention to		✓	
adopt.  NOTE: The authors did not present their research hypotheses explicitly. Th	o hypoth	nege procent	tod horo aro
derived from Figure 3 in page 90 of their paper.	е пурош	eses presem	led fiele are
Nixom, B. H., and Watson, H. J. 2001. "An Empirical Investigation of the	he Facto	re Affecting	Data
Narehousing Success," MIS Quarterly (25:1), pp. 17-38.	ile i acto	is Allecting	Data
H1a: A higher level of data quality is associated with a high level of		Ι, Ι	,
perceived net benefits.		✓	✓
H1b: A high level of system quality is associated with a high level of		√	✓
perceived net benefits.		<b>'</b>	<b>v</b>
H2a: A high level of organizational implementation success is			✓
associated with a high level of data quality.			<u> </u>
H2b: A high level of organizational implementation success is			√
associated with a high level of system quality.			, i
H3a: A high level of project implementation success is associated with a			✓
nigh level of data quality.		+ +	
H3b: A high level of project implementation success is associated with a high level of system quality.			✓
H4a: A high level of technical implementation success is associated with			
a high level of data quality.			✓
H4b: A high level of technical implementation success is associated with		<del>                                     </del>	
a high level of system quality.			✓
H5: A high level of management support is associated with a high level			,
of organizational implementation success.			✓
H6a: A strong champion presence is associated with a high level of			,
organizational implementation success.			✓
H6b: A strong champion presence is associated with a high level of			<b>√</b>
project implementation success.			`
H7a: A high level of resources is associated with a high level of			✓
organizational implementation success.			,
H7b: A high level of resources is associated with a high level of project			✓
mplementation success.			
H8a: A high level of user participation is associated with organizational mplementation success.			✓
H8b: A high level of user participation is associated with project			
mplementation success.			✓
H9a: A high level of team skills is associated with project			
mplementation success.		√	✓
19b: A high level of team skills is associated with technical		✓	,
mplementation success.		4	✓
H10: High-quality source systems are associated with technical		√	√
mplementation success.		,	
H11: Better development technology is associated with technical		√	✓
mplementation success.		· ·	
Yi, M. Y., and Davis, F. D. 2003. "Developing and Validating an Observ			
Computer Software Training and Skill Acquisition," Information Syste	ms Rese	arch (14:2),	pp. 146-169.
H1: Declarative knowledge will positively influence immediate task		✓	
performance.		+ +	
H2: Post-training software self-efficacy will positively influence		✓	
mmediate task performance.  H3: Immediate task performance will positively influence delayed task		+	
performance.		✓	
H4: Declarative knowledge will positively influence delayed task		+ +	
performance.		√	
H5: Post-training software self-efficacy will positively influence delayed		+ +	<del>-  </del>
ask performance.		√	
H6: Observational learning processes will positively influence		<del>  ,  </del>	
declarative knowledge.		√	
H7: Observational learning processes will positively influence post-		<del>  ,  </del>	
raining software self-efficacy.		✓	
H8: The retention enhancement intervention will positively influence the			
etention processes, but not the attention, production, or motivation	✓		
processes, of observational learning.  H9: Pre-training motivation to learn will positively influence the attention,			

retention, production, and motivation processes of observational learning.				
H10: Pre-training software self-efficacy will positively influence post-		✓		
training software self-efficacy.				
Zhu, K., and Kraemer, K.L. 2005. "Post-Adoption Variations in Usage				
Organizations: Cross-Country Evidence from the Retail Industry," Industry,	formation	Systems	Researc	h
(16:1), pp. 61-84.			•	
H1: Firms with greater technology competence are more likely to		✓		✓
achieve a greater extent of e-business use.		,		
H2: Controlling for resource availability effects, larger firms tend to	√			
achieve a lesser extent of e-business use.	,			
H3: Firms with greater international scope are more likely to achieve a		✓		✓
greater extent of e-business use.		, i		,
H4: Firms with greater financial commitment are more likely to achieve a	√			
greater extent of e-business use.				
H5: Firms facing higher competitive pressure are more likely to achieve	√			
a greater extent of e-business use.				
H6: Firms facing higher regulatory support are more likely to achieve a	✓			
greater extent of e-business use.				
H7: Firms with greater e-business use are more likely to generate higher		✓		✓
e-business value.				
H8: Greater e-business capabilities, including both front-end		,		
functionality and back-end integration, are positively associated with		√		√
higher e-business value.				
H9: Back-end integration will have a stronger impact on e-business		✓		
value than front-end functionality.				
H10: The strength of the antecedents of e-business use and value will	✓			
differ for developed and developing countries.	it and One	0	4 04-	<u> </u>
Zigurs, I., and Buckland, B. K. 1998. "A Theory of Task/Technology F	it and Gro	up Supp	ort Syste	ms
Effectiveness," <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (22:3), pp. 313-334. P1: Simple tasks should result in the best group performance (as	1	1	1	1
defined for the specific task) when done using a GSS configuration that	✓			
emphasizes communication support.	l *			
P2: Problem tasks should result in the best group performance (as				
defined for the specific task) when done using a GSS configuration that	✓			
emphasizes information processing.	<b>l</b> '			
P3: Decision tasks should result in the best group performance (as		1		1
defined for the specific task) when done using a GSS configuration that	✓			
emphasizes information processing and process structuring.	•			
P4: Judgment tasks should result in the best group performance (as				
defined for the specific task) when done using a GSS configuration that	✓			
emphasizes communication support and information processing.	•			
P5: Fuzzy tasks should result in the best group performance (as defined		1		
for the specific task) when done using a GSS configuration that	_			
emphasizes communication support and information processing, and	√			
includes some process structuring.		I	I	