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INTRODUCTION

The ongoing expansion of organizations’ international activities has led to a search for solutions to assist in the creation and transfer of knowledge among them, in an attempt to increase their profits (Laurie, 2002).

Knowledge sharing solutions describe three frameworks where knowledge sharing occurs: virtual communities, knowledge communities, and virtual knowledge communities.

A virtual community is defined as “a group of people with common interests who communicate via the Internet and perceive themselves as a defined group” (Jarvenpaa, Knoll, & Leidner, 1998). Knowledge sharing solutions focus on

the concentrated approach, which involves the creation of a central information base for storing information. However, this has been found to be ineffective for knowledge sharing among virtual organizations (Fahey & Prusak, 1998; Markus, 2001), mostly as a result of the fact that information is oftentimes inaccurate and frequently contains errors. A possible explanation for this phenomenon relates to the employees’ tacit knowledge, known to be necessary in order to achieve effective knowledge transfer (Grover & Davenport, 2001).

Global organizations often utilize a decentralized network supported by “peer-to-peer” (P2P) technology, which is a computer network that relies on the computing power of and the participants in the network. Such networks are useful for sharing audio and video data or anything in digital format. P2P technology serves as an infrastructure for
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virtual knowledge communities, where interactive relationships are established among users in order to transfer both explicit and tacit knowledge (Kwok & Gao, 2004).

Establishing a virtual community is perceived as a knowledge management strategy, the goal of which is to assist an organization’s knowledge management processes regarding human capital via technological tools that enable interaction among employees in real time (Cortada & Woods, 2000).

Despite the ever-increasing expansion of the establishment of virtual knowledge communities, thus far very little is known about the factors that lead individuals who participate in virtual communities to share their knowledge and, as a result, enhance the success of the community (Ardichvili, Page, & Wentling, 2003). Concurrently, the expanded activities of virtual organizations create an interest and an added challenge when it comes to examining the factors that motivate employees to participate in virtual communities (McLure & Faraj, 2000).

The current article is an attempt to minimize the gap in the existing literature and industry regarding the factors that motivate knowledge sharing among employees in virtual communities/organizations. The second part of the chapter will define the term knowledge community and will focus on virtual knowledge communities. The third part of the work will present a review of the knowledge sharing factors implemented in virtual communities. In the fourth part, we present a theoretical model that identifies the factors that motivate employees’ knowledge sharing in virtual communities. The fifth part of the work presents future research directions. Finally, in the sixth part, we present a summary and major conclusions.

**VIRTUAL KNOWLEDGE COMMUNITIES**

Organizations today are actively trying to create a technological infrastructure in order to provide a means of dialog among employees who cannot meet face-to-face because of communication limitations stemming from global business operations. This is an attempt to increase knowledge transfer among participants who wish to share their experiences and problems within the context of a virtual community. A virtual knowledge community is defined as “business partners and members of work teams dispersed throughout the world who communicate via information technologies.” Virtual knowledge communities have been categorized into three groups (Soekijad et al., 2004):