As observed by the great management thinker Peter F. Drucker in many of his interviews and writings, the core concern of today’s organizations should be to improve efficiency and effectiveness of knowledge workers. Their work is characterized by the uniqueness of knowledge they create and the knowledge they apply in their everyday tasks. Thus, an organization’s prime focus should be on improving the utilization of existing knowledge and fostering creation of new knowledge that is being presently used and that will be used in current and future decision making activities. One of the important interventions in this sense is introducing knowledge management systems (KMS) that support and enable existing knowledge utilization and new knowledge creation. The processes of designing such a knowledge management (KM) system and diffusing it are, however, complex and touch various issues related to organizational design, IS design, and technological innovation. Understanding how end-users interact with the process of designing or introducing a KMS, and/or how end-users use the KMS itself, is essential but a challenging task nonetheless for both researchers and practitioners.

Out of all of the manuscripts submitted in response to our call for articles on the Special Issue on Interacting with Knowledge Management Systems, nine articles were selected for publication. These articles are published in two volumes. The first volume, which had already been published, discussed mainly KMS design and implementation issues.

The second volume, which you are reading, contains five articles that focus on central themes around KMS use such as evaluation, appraisal, and success of KMS. The second volume begins with an article by Poston and Speier (“Knowledge Management Systems Usage: Rating Scheme Validity and the Effort-Accuracy Trade-Off”), which examines the validity of the rating scheme end-users apply and how such scheme influences end-users’ accuracy of trade-off judgment and decision-making between the search and the evaluation effort. Without valid ratings, greater search efforts increased the amount of higher-quality content included in task solutions; however, contrary to expectations, greater evaluation effort did not increase the quality of content used. Through an experiment, the authors found that the rating scheme did help users to make efficient searches; however, it also helped users to correctly evaluate the quality of the content in the KMS.

The second article, by Rasmussen and Haggerty (“Knowledge Appraisal and Knowledge Management Systems: Judging What We Know”), provides an in-depth understanding of knowledge appraisal practice in organizations. Drawing on archival theory, the authors develop a taxonomy of the knowledge appraisal practice. The taxonomy is developed based on two di-
mensions: the level of the appraiser (individual and organizational) and the types of knowledge (tacit and explicit knowledge). Finally, the authors capture the dynamics of knowledge appraisal practices by integrating the taxonomy with the knowledge management cycles.

The third article shifts our attention to an individual level. The article, by Ravishankar ("Rewarding end-users for participating in organizational KM: A Case study"), studies motivation for end-users to adopt KMS. Although many organizations implement a reward scheme to motivate end-users to utilize KMS, how and why such reward programs are perceived by end-users are less understood. In order to promote an in-depth understanding, the author conducted a fieldwork to study the KMS rewards program of a leading Indian software services and products company for 6 months over a 2 year period. While a rewards program may play an important role in generating awareness about KM, it is also vital that managers incorporate phased changes in the structuring of a KM-related rewards program. One of the findings is that organizations need to build awareness of a KMS rewards program. "Awareness building" is found to be an important process that is necessary for organizations to successfully implement any KMS rewards program.

The fourth article, by Jennex ("Exploring System Use as a Measure of Knowledge Management Success"), draws our attention to a measurement scheme of the KMS success. Any project conducted needs to have a clear goal, attainment of which should be transparently evaluated. One of the factors often associated with KMS failures is lack of success metrics—knowing how to measure the KMS success would decrease the rate of design and implementation failures. The KMS success model, which is grounded in a framework devised by Delone and McLean IS success model with the flavor of KM specificities, is developed and tested through a longitudinal case study. The empirical findings support the proposed model—readers will benefit from the specific finding that states that quantity of "use" is not a good measure of KMS success and will lead to incorrect decisions on the effectiveness, adoption, or actual value of a KMS.

The final article of the issue, by Richards ("A Call for Change in the Call Center"), studied KMS use by knowledge workers working in a call center. It presented findings of a case study that was conducted to investigate problems and issues surrounding KMS use by call center workers. Despite the existence of many knowledge management tools, knowledge is scattered across disparate sources and often requires implicit "know-how" to utilize effectively. The findings have implications for KMS design which need to consider local needs. The approach suggested by the author allows knowledge, in the form of rules, to be incrementally acquired as the problem arises, in the form of cases, as a part of the daily routine.

To summarize, in this two-volume issue, various perspectives of end-user interaction with KMS are presented. Articles published have covered managerial perspectives of the successful implementation, user-adoption, metrics and evaluation of KMS, and its implications for KMS design. Our special issue has the following implications: most importantly, a clear difference between IS and KMS is found in any process/practice such as design, implementation, and measuring success. Unlike traditional IS, KMS is largely dependent on the context such as types of users, their knowledge needs, the organizational environment, and the organizational culture. In a way, successful implementation of KMS may be highly dependent on how an end-user perceives knowledge in the system and utilizes KMS.

Even though Knowledge Management has been a hot topic for more than a decade, it remains a relatively young discipline and more research is needed to develop generally accepted frameworks for its design, implementation, use, and maintenance. We believe that the interaction between users and KMS will further evolve in the coming years. To overcome information load, visualization tools, for example, are promising interfaces that can be used to map knowledge and to facilitate and to improve decision making. Text mining technology can be used to extract and manage knowledge hidden in the large amount of unstructured or semistructured information that comprises the digital asset of a company (e.g., documents, reports, e-mails, presentations, blogs, and Web contents). Evaluation of the content is one of the major weapons in fighting the information overload; however, much more can still be said about what are good-rating-validity indicators and content quality measures. The human
aspect of KM remains the critical factor of KMS success. Facilitating the capture and transfer of tacit knowledge as well as encouraging people to share remain some of the difficulties of KMS. The role of technology as the enabler of KM will grow. Providing the right information at the right time in the right format to the right person in the right place will be more feasible in a technological sense than ever before. Organizations need, however, to develop competencies in building and diffusing these systems. Nevertheless, more research must be conducted in order to make the interaction between users and the KMS more integrated into applications, more intuitive, more transparent, and more user-friendly so it is not seen as an add-on causing additional work. Providing such systems and environments will help knowledge workers to be more effective and more efficient while providing them with the knowledge that will help them to learn, to grow, and to innovate.