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Abstract
Can organisations use internal social technologies to increase productivity and foster innovation? Do management and employees fully appreciate the benefits of social technologies in the workplace? Are the tools available being fully utilised within organisations? This research looks at the use of social media for organisations, referred to as Enterprise Social Networks (ESN). An examination of four Irish organisations was undertaken to explore how these organisations are using social networking to support their business functions. All four organisations use the platform Yammer and this research highlights the challenges encountered when introducing this social media technology into the corporate environment and provides an analysis of the factors which influence its acceptance, perception, social influence and implementation. The research concludes with recommendations for organisations considering the introduction of an enterprise social network.

The concept of using social media to increase engagement with customers and improve customer service is one we are all familiar with. Many organisations have developed strategies to capitalise on this however the transfer of customer-facing social strategies to internal operations is not clear-cut. Many organisations understand how social media can add value to their customer service but are only just beginning to explore how social media could benefit internal communications, knowledge-sharing and collaboration. The key is to understand how social interaction can support business processes by facilitating company-wide communication across divisions and hierarchies.

Our study is framed by research on change management, technology acceptance, and social networking. A review of relevant literature across these broad areas of study is provided. In order to examine the use of Yammer and strategies employed in its implementation within the four organisations, a survey and interviews were conducted. The study was classified into five central themes in order to provide a thorough analysis of the research question. These themes were ‘experience’, ‘social influence’, ‘management’, ‘access flexibility’, and ‘communications’.

Ten hypotheses were formulated for this study. Chapter 4 presents the findings. Hypothesis 1 supported, highlighting that Facebook experience positively influences the perceived ease of use of Yammer. Hypothesis 2 is supported also as individuals with higher levels of computing skills found Yammer’s functionality easy to use. Contrary to literature findings regarding the adoption of an ESN within an organisation, it was found that employees with more years’ experience within the organisation are more likely to be socially influenced. Therefore hypothesis 3 is not supported.

The role of social influence is supported in both hypotheses 4 and 5 as the perceived critical mass of active Yammer users was a contributing factor of an individual’s intention to use Yammer, as was the use of Yammer by colleagues. Hypotheses 6 and 7 are supported as active encouragement from line managers and senior managers was seen to positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

Results from hypothesis 8 proved inconclusive. Despite respondents agreeing that Yammer can provide quick access to information and facilitate better communications, more research is required to determine whether this positive sentiment is sufficient to support the hypothesis.
Due to the low level of mobile users, hypothesis 9 could not be fully examined. Finally, when structured internal communications take place within an organisation, employees are more inclined to engage with the Yammer platform, therefore hypothesis 10 is supported.

A final insight from the data analysis revealed that Yammer Notifier, a desktop application for Yammer, could increase an individual’s intention to contribute more regularly to the social network.
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“We are what we share.”

Charles Leadbeater

1.1 Introduction
The development of social technologies has transformed every aspect of daily life. The embedding of social technologies into the global ecosystem has resulted in major social changes in both personal and professional realms and has made it possible to track an individual’s activity, interactions, movements and interests.

These technological developments have resulted in benefits and challenges for both the individual and the organisation. In a professional capacity they must be viewed in terms of their advancement, their place within modern day society and the organisation, and the effects and implications of their use on individuals, particularly in terms of connectedness, productivity, social engagement, culture and resistance to change (Bughin et al., 2012). This study aims to address these points from a technical standpoint by conducting a case study on an enterprise social network (ESN), specifically Yammer.

The Yammer platform is similar to Facebook but used exclusively in a professional environment. Over 500,000 companies, including 85% of the Fortune 500 companies, use Yammer [1]. Like other Enterprise Social Networks, Yammer allows users create a profile and connect with colleagues in order to foster communication and collaboration, promote the dissemination of news, and assist with information transfer and knowledge management [2]. Its main competitors in this space are IBM Connections, Salesforce’s Chatter and Jive. Owned by Microsoft, Yammer forms part of the Microsoft Office 365 suite, the most popular software solution in Ireland which is why it has been chosen as the focus of this study. Although companies are investing in the ESN space, little academic research has been conducted on the area.

Ireland is home to the European headquarters of some of the biggest social networking platforms in the world including Facebook, Twitter and Google. Despite this, the Irish International Business Network has revealed that social media remains a challenge for many businesses in Ireland [3]. Proponents for ESN claim that internal social platforms will become an essential communication tool in the future and making business more social will lead to increased collaboration adding business value, yet it is difficult to find evidence to support these arguments [4]. On the Yammer website [5] testimonials from companies claim that Yammer has helped “unite different geographies and lines of business” (Esquel Group), “strengthen global business” (Sharp), “create a dialogue-based culture to boost innovation” (LexisNexis), and “encourage team collaboration” (ModCloth).
Anecdotal evidence would suggest that participation on a social networking platform can wane over time unless users take some value from participation. If this occurs, users simply revert to their usual modes of communication. The value of an ESN is linked to a critical mass of users; if the objective for using it is not clearly communicated from the outset within the enterprise, users tend to disengage. The conclusion is that Yammer must fulfil a certain need in order to encourage and sustain employee engagement. The goal of this research is to explore the implementation and usage of Yammer in four Irish organisations.

1.2 Background to the Research and Rationale
According to Global Web Index [6] a quarter of people worldwide, the equivalent of 40% of Internet users, use social media. This new level of world connectedness has prompted businesses to assess how value can be achieved and industries can be invigorated through the use of social technologies. Alistair Rennie, general manager of IBM’s social business unit said: “To truly realise the full potential of a social business, leaders need to empower a company’s most vital asset – the information being generated from its people. Now it is time for business leaders to embed social into their key business processes to shift their business from the era of ‘liking’ to ‘leading’.”

Social networks such as Facebook, Twitter, WeChat and LinkedIn have re-formulated the way people communicate with each other and how information is transferred. According to a study conducted by the Harvard Business Review in 2010 almost 80% of 2,100 companies surveyed currently used or planned to use social media, while 70% of their employees expected their use of social media would increase. This finding parallels the growth in the use of ESN within organisations.

While there are similarities between public online social networks, such as Facebook, and enterprise social networks, such as Yammer, it is clear that the same enthusiasm for engagement seen with
personal social networks (PSN) has not been translated to those that exist within the enterprise. This distinction and the implications it has for organisations looking to adopt an ESN makes the study of ESNs important.

This paper focuses on the use of Yammer within four organisations. The companies chosen have implemented the Yammer platform to varying degrees allowing for an analysis of its impact at different times in the implementation life cycle with one organisation assessing the success of their pilot project as a basis for wider implementation. The size of the organisations range from 800 to 28,000 employees and cover a variety of industries.

The study provides statistics on usage of the social platform across the four companies and reveals insights on how and why ESNs are being used in order to address questions on user motivations, technology adoption, change management, internal communications, and collaboration within organisational boundaries. While email is still seen by many as the main medium for professional communications, organic growth of instant messaging and social media applications within organisations has begun to take place which can foster collaboration in a work environment. One of the motivations for wanting to delve deeper into the use of an ESN within the organisations was to establish the factors effecting the adoption of the social platform and to ascertain if the use of an ESN helped to break down boundaries within the organisation through informal internal communications as they claim to do. Another incentive was to define what motivates employees’ engagement with an enterprise social network application. A third objective was to see if there was any correlation between the use of PSNs and the use of an ESN in order to determine if use of a PSN can positively influence the use of an ESN, in this case specifically Yammer.

### 1.3 Setting the Context

In this paper the authors present a study of ESN use in four organisations. Organisation A is a government organisation with approximately 800 employees and offices in numerous locations worldwide; Organisation B is a global fast moving consumer goods industry (FMCG) with 28,000 employees around the world; Organisation C is an academic institution with approximately 2,500 staff members based in Dublin; Organisation D is an Irish utility company with over 1,000 staff based in Ireland.

All four of the organisations have the Yammer platform and each use the ESN to varying degrees. Yammer, an enterprise-wide microblogging tool, was established in 2008. Since then, it has developed new features that foster collaboration amongst users [8]. In the organisations studied, Yammer was implemented at different times over the last seven years with varying levels of corporate backing.

The data analysis work presented in this document aims to provide some statistics on the use of the ESN within the organisations in order to provide insights into how they are being used and what motivates employees to contribute to the enterprise social network. A study by Brzozowski et al. (2009) showed that geographically dispersed groups were more motivated to contribute to an ESN and that visible comments encouraged contributors to continue being active on the social network. The research conducted for this study is the basis for further analyses on user motivation for posting to an ESN along with patterns in posting behaviour.
Interviews with ESN project managers within each of the organisations aims to gain a deeper insight into the objectives and current status of the ESN within the organisations. This study is framed by referring to related research on personal social networks and enterprise social networks giving a wider context to the paper. From an examination of the data collected, conclusions have been drawn along with recommendations for organisations looking to successfully implement a valued enterprise social network.

1.4 Purpose of the Research and Significance of the Study
There has been a significant amount of research conducted into the area of public and enterprise social networks however there is limited content on the implementation and operation of an ESN, specifically Yammer, in an Irish context. This research aims to provide a baseline study for the examination of ESN usage within Irish organisations and aims to extend our understanding of technology adoption in relation to social networking platforms. The study also addresses the key factors that need to be considered when introducing a new technology into an organisation and takes account of the issues associated with online social networking sites.

1.5 Research Aims and Questions
The aim of this research is to examine how an enterprise social network has been deployed in an Irish context by comparing the implementation, adoption by staff, usage and perceived value of Yammer in four organisations. The analysis has been grouped into five principal areas as follows:

- **Experience:** The amount of technical, organisational and social networking experience demonstrated by an individual will impact on the adoption levels of Yammer as a collaborative tool.
- **Social Influence:** The use of Yammer by peers encourages its adoption and engagement amongst new users of the technology, and the number of people using the technology is a contributing factor in relation to social engagement online.
- **Management:** A proactive contribution by managers encourages employees’ adoption of Yammer and increases employee engagement on the social network.
- **Access Flexibility:** The ability to access Yammer on multiple devices, from any location, and the immediacy of access to information will encourage interaction on the platform.
- **Communication:** The degree and clarity of internal communications regarding the enterprise social network directly affects user participation.

In order to fully examine these research areas and focus the study, ten hypotheses were formulated:

- **Hypothesis 1:** Facebook experience will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.
- **Hypothesis 2:** Computer self-efficacy will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.
Hypothesis 3: Individuals with less years’ experience within the organisation will be more influenced by social engagement leading to a greater intention to use Yammer.

Hypothesis 4: Perceived reach of critical mass threshold will positively influence the intention to use Yammer.

Hypothesis 5: The use of Yammer by colleagues will positively influence an individuals’ intention to use Yammer.

Hypothesis 6: The use and encouragement of Yammer by line managers will positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

Hypothesis 7: Active contribution on Yammer by senior management will positively influence the use of Yammer for individuals.

Hypothesis 8: Speed of access to information will positively influence the perceived usefulness of Yammer.

Hypothesis 9: The use of mobile devices will increase an individuals’ activity on Yammer.

Hypothesis 10: Structured internal communications positively influences the intention to use Yammer.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

When conducting the research for this study the authors were aware of a number of factors that could have a significant impact on the study, most notably the varying degrees to which the Yammer was embedded in the organisation’s culture and the extent to which Yammer was utilised within the four companies examined.

The authors’ backgrounds and personal use of technology was also taken into account and it was recognised that it may not be reflective of the full target audience examined. With this in mind, a conscious effort was made by the team to ensure no bias existed when analysing results. The project idea originally stemmed from the importance social media increasingly plays in people’s lives, both personally and professionally. These emerging social technologies have gained ground in organisations who are looking to use them to gain a competitive advantage (Hanna et al., 2011). A review of the literature in this area showed however, that organisations often lacked a clear strategy for engaging in the social media realm and struggled to employ the tools successfully for professional purposes. Some employees were sceptical of these new technologies leading to early rejection while others were simply unaware of their existence within the organisation (Guinan et al., 2014). These findings, reflections and experiences formed the foundations for a deeper analysis of existing literature in this area.

The mixed-method approach employed for this study generated a significant amount of data which the authors use in the analysis section. It must be noted, however, that the majority of respondents were from Organisation A so all efforts were made to ensure that results from that one organisation did not distort the overall findings. Where applicable, this is highlighted in the findings and conclusions were drawn in light of that knowledge.

The main limitation of the study was the fact that the implementation of Yammer in each of the organisations differed. For example, there were varying numbers of respondents in each of the organisations in the survey. The use of interviews aimed to balance out this weakness and afforded
the researchers the opportunity to more thoroughly explore the rationale for piloting Yammer within the organisation. This qualitative research led to interesting findings in relation to organisational culture and willingness to adopt new technologies. A combination of these results forms the basis of the recommendations for managers who are interested in successfully introducing social collaboration tools into their organisations.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis
Chapter 2: Literature Review
This chapter provides a comprehensive discussion on the key areas of research that support the study of enterprise social networks within the organisation. Research into the development of social technologies, change management, technology adoption, and individual motivations was conducted in order to provide a foundation for the analysis of the data compiled for this study.

Chapter 3: Methodology
This chapter describes in detail the research methodology employed in this study. It offers a rationale for using a mixed-method approach that combined qualitative and quantitative techniques, and outlines in detail the process undertaken while conducting the research for this study. Ten research question is stated along with the rationale for structuring the research and analysis using the Brown et al. (2010) research model which was deemed the most pertinent of all the technology adoption models to this study.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Findings
This chapter provides a comprehensive analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data gathered during the survey and interview process. The results are presented under the five themes that provide the principle structure for this study and ten main hypotheses are addressed. An analysis of the place of Yammer within each of the organisations is made which form the basis for the conclusions that were drawn.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations
The final chapter summarises the main conclusions of the study. The authors make reference to the research contributions the study has made. Recommendations from the research findings are presented on how social networking tools such as Yammer can be best introduced into an organisation.
“We are becoming symbiotic with our computer tools”  
Sparrow et al., (2011)

2.1 Introduction  
The emergence of social technologies means that there is an immense body of research relating to this ever evolving area. Research suggests that “we are becoming symbiotic with our computer tools, growing into interconnected systems that remember less by knowing information than by knowing where the information can be found” (Sparrow et al., 2011, p. 4). While email and the Internet have undoubtedly opened up new channels in communications, through upgraded bandwidth infrastructures and persistent technology advancements, “social media sites are redefining our lives, both personal and professional” (Dyrud, 2011, p. 476).

This chapter aims to provide a review of relevant literature in order to delineate key areas that support our study namely the explosion of social technologies, enterprise social networks, change management, and technology adoption and acceptance.

The following section provides an overview of the specific research conducted in these key areas.

2.2 Social Technologies  
Social media is another term for social networking or social technologies. “The term social media was coined to describe these and other new platforms of digital communication that continually appear in this interactive electronic environment, underlining their participative and collaborative social characteristics” (Vernuccio, 2014, p.213). Treem & Leonardi (2012) provide a comprehensive review of the development of social media and trace the first publicly popular social networking site back to SixDegrees.com, which was launched in 1997. SixDegrees.com, like social networking sites in use today, heralded the beginning of social networks and provided users the means by which to create online personal profiles and cultivate social networks of friends. The introduction of MySpace and Facebook followed in 2003 and 2004 respectively, promptly followed by Twitter in 2006 (Ibid).

The development of social technologies and networks such as Facebook, and Twitter, and online tools like wikis, forums and blogs has nurtured a culture of sharing and collaboration. This cultural shift has not been lost on or ignored by business leaders who have recognised the potential for increasing productivity in their workforce (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; Bughin et al., 2012). New tools have steadily emerged with the advancement of Web 2.0 technologies. Mooney et al. (2010)
surmise that the internet is being transformed from a web of information (Web 1.0) to a web of participation (Web 2.0). Among the primary Web 2.0 tools and applications are social networking sites that introduced the idea of digitising real world connections. New technologies include enterprise social networks, mobile applications, collaboration platforms, and interactive social tools.

The adoption of social technologies by businesses has continued to increase steadily over the last number of years. According to a survey conducted by McKinsey & Company [13] in which 4,200 global executives were surveyed about how social technologies can extend the organisation, the majority believed that when social technologies are successfully integrated into the work processes of employees, associated benefits such as a growth in market share and an increase in financial profits could be seen.

Organisations are seeing these new social technologies as having benefits both internally and externally. They provide a way of differentiating the offering, enhancing relationships with customers, and increasing productivity, while also facilitating employee collaboration, all of which can contribute to organisational success (Fenwich et al., 2011).

Another perspective suggests that computer networks are inherently social networks which link people, organisations, and knowledge (Wellman, 2001). Wellman theorises that the proliferation of computer networks has facilitated the growth of networked societies. He believes that these societies are loosely bound and sparsely knit resulting in a movement away from group solidarities at work and in the community. He calls for new tools to be developed to assist people in navigating and accessing information in these networked societies which he sees as complex and fragmented. Wellman’s beliefs highlight a common challenge faced by organisations when attempting to effectively implement a social networking culture for the benefit of the greater business.

There are significant challenges in measuring the value of social networking tools for businesses, with most companies struggling to measure the success of social software (Richter et al., 2013). The impact of social technologies in enterprises is not well understood, despite an increase in research in this area (Riemer et al., 2012). Debates have taken place around the amount of investment that should be made in the social space. According to research conducted by Gartner (2013), social initiatives can lack purpose as organisations jump in just to appear to be active in that space. The use of social networking to increase business value has been difficult to realise for some. Verheyden & Goeman (2013, p.8) argue that while enterprises have reached an assured maturity in using social media for customer facing and marketing processes, “they often fail to identify how to leverage social media tools into other areas”.

Several key learnings have appeared through an analysis of unsuccessful social media initiatives. Common mistakes include launching social business projects in the absence of clear project objectives, the reluctance to invest time and money into initiatives, and an expectation that returns will happen overnight (Verheyden & Goeman, 2013, p.9). This results in a recurring cycle of scenarios where high expectations contribute to disappointment if expected results or financial gains are not realised.

According to Verheyden & Goeman (2013), 99% of all companies in the European Union are small-medium sized enterprises (SMEs), employing over half of the European workforce. The researchers argue that while there has been a swift evolution of social media deployment for business purposes,
the level of adoption is strongly related to company size. In a study of 430 Microsoft employees, Skeels & Grudin (2009) found that Facebook is used extensively to build rapport and stronger working relationships between colleagues. It was found that people also used Facebook networks for information-gathering in a professional context.

It is clear that the acceptance of social networking and adoption of social media has matured within organisations; challenges remain in how these new paradigms can be aligned with business strategy and how a tangible return on investment can be attained. Without a clear strategy for how social technologies can both support and benefit traditional areas such as marketing, talent identification, and research and development, efforts in the social space can be misdirected, not used to their full potential, revenue can be lost, and a company’s brand equity and reputation can be adversely affected. For example, the lack of consideration for the social web propelled Netflix into the midst of a social media disaster in 2011. Despite being active on social media the company did not use social media to their advantage before releasing a new pricing package. If they had optimised an internal collaboration tool such as Yammer, they could have quickly activated a response team with the necessary knowledge to address the backlash online. They could have also used a collaboration tool to explore solutions to the business problem [14]. With this example in mind it is clear that a more formalised and strategic approach is required for appraising and incorporating social technologies into everyday work processes and procedures.

So how can organisations, both large and small, introduce and harness the potential afforded by enterprise social networks specifically designed for workplace collaboration? How can organisations foster environments so that these innovative tools have the best chance of adoption? To address these areas the research will first look at the advancement of enterprise social networks before addressing both change management and technology adoption.

2.3 Enterprise Social Networks

In today’s competitive global economy, companies need to find the most effective way to engage and collaborate with all stakeholders to achieve mutual success (Guinan et al., 2014). Many forward-thinking organisations have already begun the process of formalising programmes to identify, train and leverage key individuals to jumpstart enterprise social success (Koplowitz, 2011). Examining the challenges and opportunities of social media, Kaplan & Haenlein (2010) suggest that virtual content sharing and social media, enabled by technical advances over the last 20 years, represent a revolutionary new trend which should be of interest to all companies.

Organisations that employ Enterprise Social Networks (ESNs), such as Yammer, expect better intra-organisational communication, effective knowledge sharing and greater collaboration (Alarifi & Sedera, 2013). It has been pointed out that ESNs are struggling to gain credibility with employees despite their similarities with Personal Social Networks (PSNs), such as Facebook and Twitter (Ibid).

A historical perspective on social media use in organisations is provided by Leonardi et al. (2013) who discuss how an ESN can emerge in one of three ways: the use of publicly available sites such as Facebook and Google+; private implementations of open source or proprietary software; or in-house proprietary solutions such as IBM’s Beehive. They define ESN (2013, p.2) as “web-based platforms that allow workers to (1) communicate messages with specific co-workers or broadcast messages to
everyone in the organisation; (2) explicitly indicate or implicitly reveal particular co-workers as communication partners; (3) post, edit, and sort text and files linked to themselves or others; and (4) view the messages, connections, text, and files communicated, posted, edited and sorted by anyone else in the organisation at any time of their choosing”. Although this view captures some of the key characteristics and benefits of ESNs there are other advantages that companies can leverage through the adoption and strategic use of an ESN.

The advent of the digital era has introduced new forums for the expression of employee voice. It is believed that those organisations which understand how these new platforms operate and which can harness the power of employee voice will have a competitive advantage over others (Myles & Mangold, 2014). Before ESN applications were established, employees often independently networked with co-workers on PSNs. Security concerns and issues around productivity drove the implementation of ESNs which was deliberately not made available to external audiences. As referred to by Leonardi et al. (2013) these early private social networks would be open source or proprietary systems, usually hosted in-house or procured through Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) provisioning. Early examples include the introduction of wikis on company intranets and internal blogging communities.

There is a limited understanding of the use of social media for work purposes, regardless of social media being at the top of the agenda for many companies (Treem & Leonardi, 2012). Despite the continued use of these technologies, significant challenges remain in terms of achieving value from ‘being social’ (Guinan et al., 2014). The organisation needs to assess the value of investing in IT and demonstrate the potential return on that investment; however the implications of social media technologies for organisational processes are not yet fully understood or documented. Leftheriotis & Giannokus (2014, p. 135) define Enterprise Social Networks developed for companies as web-based services, which allow “individuals to create and maintain online public or semi-public profiles and to foster connections with other members of that organisation”.

Organisations, however, have significant variations in terms of the level of technical literacy of staff. There are as many as four generations of workers employed in some organisations today: Traditionalists, Baby boomers, Generation X and Generation Y, with Generation Y considered to be more diverse than any generation that has come before them (Mooney et al., 2010). “This is the first generation of people that work, play, think and learn differently than their parents. They are the first generation to not be afraid of technology. It’s like the air to them” (Tapscott, 1998).

The familiarity younger employees have with social tools makes them the most likely adopters of new collaborative platforms such as ESNs. The majority of these ‘digital natives’ (Prensky, 2001) that were brought up with the Internet are already using PSNs and related technologies for their personal connections, making adoption of them in a work environment somewhat easier than technology-averse individuals (Palfrey & Gasser, 2008). This group have much to gain from being social in work as the majority of organisational knowledge exists within fellow employees and not on company intranets, websites or databases. The formation of valuable work relationships motivates this group to engage online; however in order to realise the full value of social media technologies in a work setting, a diverse employee spread and respective critical mass is required to effectively engage (Lou et al., 2000). For the younger generation, a productive working life seems hard to
imagine without contemporary technologies but to the more traditional, less tech-savvy workforce, these tools can be viewed as distractions to the core business (Schooley, 2005).

The differences between the use of social media outside work and within the workplace are examined by Yardi et al. (2009). They explore why the attention economy which motivates participation in peer-produced sites on the web such as YouTube and Wikipedia appears to break down at work. One suggestion is that the dynamics of attention allocation in the workplace is different from those of the social web, such as the size of the audience and the level of expectation of acknowledgment, attention and reward. They suggest that the two most influential factors associated with corporate social networking effectiveness are whether or not others are engaging with their post, and whether there is management support for online social activities. New employees could view online collaboration as a way to increase their visibility within an organisation. Skeels & Grudin (2009) discuss the trend for the introduction of new technologies that lag behind student use and that students often introduce these technologies into corporations. This supports the theory that users are likely to be from younger generations.

The introduction of email enabled more informal communication across different management levels in organisations, although it took time for unwritten conventions to form around its use (Skeels & Grudin, 2009). Similarly social conventions for the usage of social networking are evolving with the development of the software. According to Astebro (1995) the challenges directly associated with electronic mail systems implementation were as a direct result of its non-compulsory enforcement and discretionary use and states that “understanding how to manage the implementation of information systems has proven to be a very challenging issue in information systems research” (Ibid, p.319).

A recurring conundrum for senior management in this regard is what actions can be proactively taken to encourage use and in doing so what impact, either positive or negative, might this have on its success. Do they “do nothing and let preferences and social norms drive use of EMS; or coerce employees to start using EMS?”(Astebro, 1995, p.319). A clear implementation strategy is required, one that has been informed by measuring resource requirements, potential uptake or resistance, and acquisition costs. Astebro (1995, p.320) argues that “the theory of social information processing predicts that individual perceptions and behaviour are influenced by the opinions, information, and behaviours of salient others, especially in ambiguous or indeterminate situations”. Although this type of information system implementation is considered to be shrouded in uncertainty, it is believed that senior management can strongly influence adoption and acceptance of new ways of working (Astebro, 1995).

The range of employees’ technical skills can lead to challenges when getting individuals to adopt and engage with new software tools and applications, especially when the direct and indirect benefits are not immediately evident. It is easy for employees to see the value in shared databases or spreadsheets but the value of social collaboration is less transparent. Therefore, individuals who are used to working and collaborating in a set way may be slow to recognise the value that wider collaboration could bring. If we are to believe that social technologies have the potential to foster innovation, collaboration and productivity within the organisation then effective ways must be found to encourage their use, but as research has proven, challenges do still exist. (Alarifi & Sedera, 2013).
2.4 **Enterprise Social Networks and Personal Social Networks**

A key difference between enterprise social networks and other social technologies is that the former are primarily concerned with networking within an organisation whereas the latter are used for personal social networking.

As highlighted by Yardi *et al.* (2009), motivations for participation on social sites differ in the workplace and although similarities exist, the platforms are not comparable in terms of size and value. The size of the audience is a key difference that exists between ESNs and PSNs. The audience is potentially much higher for other social networks than for those designed for the enterprise. As Skeels & Grudin (2009) discuss, Facebook is well designed for reconnecting to former classmates and colleagues, and their survey found that posts from professional colleagues about changes in their careers, new technologies they were experiencing, and other details about their professional activities provided insight into broader trends.

However DiMicco *et al.* (2008) found in their study of IBM’s Beehive Social Network (which has since evolved into IBM’s Connections software) that while part of using the networking tool is concerned with connecting with fellow employees, the value of the tool for the average employee is more information-centric than social, where employees search for and discover new corporate information.

As enterprise social networks are communication tools, their use will be influenced by or reflective of social conventions, which will differ between external and internal enterprise environments. This is a key difference to usage of social networks external to the work environment. The use of social networks in organisations as with the implementation and use of all new or refreshed technologies in the organisation will be directed by internal policies and guidelines. Alarifi & Sedera (2013) suggest that governance in the form of clear and easy-to-understand guidelines can help employees’ proficiency and to find solutions through collaboration.

Communication in hierarchical organisations can be restricted in that employees may be reluctant to contact colleagues in more senior positions in the organisation (Milliken *et al*., 2003). Stieglitz *et al.* (2014) state that new information technologies have provided people with new, easy ways to communicate and interact on a larger scale, and they discuss how some proponents of ESN argue that these tools enable employees to interact as equals across hierarchical levels.

The introduction of new technologies has always been challenging. In the 1990s some researchers were arguing that organisations would discover that email reduced productivity and it would be removed. Ten years later similar arguments were being made against instant messaging (Skeels & Grudin, 2009). Today, both email and instant messaging are well-established in the majority of modern organisations. Mobility of the workforce is another key factor. Schadler & McCarthy (2012, p. 2) argue that “the access and convenience of mobile apps and devices shifts more power from institutions to individuals than did the PC or the Web.” They further predict that by 2016 “350 million employees will use smartphones” with 200 million of these employees bringing their own devices to work. Debuting in 2009, BYOD (Bring Your Own Device) [9] refers to the alternative strategy of permitting employees and business partners to use personally owned mobile devices (not limited to laptops, tablets and smart phones) to access company data and execute enterprise applications [10]. BYOD strategies are creating new opportunities and challenges for business and IT
leaders [11]. By 2016 over 30% of BYOD strategies will leverage personal applications, data and social connections for enterprise purposes [12].

With this in mind, the speed of technological change can be challenging for modern organisations that are trying to keep up-to-date with consumer trends. The use of mobile devices has become pervasive and access to the internet is easier. In line with this, the trend to access corporate data on the same device as personal applications increases. The interchangeable nature of business and private environments has benefits and challenges for the business. Employees often feel pressurised to complete their day-to-day tasks and resistance can develop when new technologies or information systems are introduced. According to Martinko et al. (1996) ‘user’s resistance’ is the likely cause of information technology implementation failure because it involves a change of users’ behaviour to handle new tools. As most change in an organisation is as a result of technology, managing change is a key area to consider when looking at introducing ESN into the workplace.

2.5 Managing ICT Change

Management of change plays a key role in the success of any organisation yet it has been estimated that 70% of change initiatives fail (Beer & Nohria, 2001). According to Humphrey (1989), the management of IT focuses on technical issues, ignoring the behavioural issues related to users’. When considering a new IT implementation, failing to manage the change can lead to significant consequences including reduced productivity, and loss of revenue or business. The change management process refers to the way in which a change is employed and managed within the organisation (Duck 2000). It is important to understand how change should be managed when introducing new IT within an organisation (Regan & O’Connor, 2000).

In modern business the majority of change management involves information technology, for example the upgrade of software, the introduction of new systems or a change to IT products. However, the track record for implementing such changes is not very good and MIT’s Management in the 1990s found that the benefits of IT are not being realised as investment is heavily biased toward technology rather than managing changes in processes and organisation culture (Benjamin & Levinson, 1993).

Each proposed change requires a specific change management plan tailored to that change detailing a clear roadmap on how to implement the change and evaluate impact of the change on the organisation (Rash, 2010). The deployment of new systems within an organisation requires a detailed work process to plan a schedule of work detailing any dependencies that exist that will effect implementation. But change management is not just about the change management process. As mentioned above, an understanding of the organisational culture and staff can also play a critical role in ensuring as smooth a change process as possible.

When planning change to an organisation’s IT infrastructure or services it is essential to not only know the current IT set-up within the organisation but also the desired future state for where the business wishes to go (Johnston, 2002). Change management requires a number of skills and tools including structured communications, financial budgeting, analytical skills, risk identification and systems planning. Senge et al. (1999) highlight how important the idea of learning is when managing IT change within an organisation. The authors suggest four main management issues
including motivation, training and technical support, rewards and supervisor support, and collaborative, open discussion.

A key theme in the change management literature is that buy-in from the company leadership is crucial to the success of change initiatives. According to Sirkin et al. (2005), if employees don’t see that the company’s leadership is backing a project, they are unlikely to change and they go so far as to say that if senior executives do not communicate the need for a change, and what it means for the employees, they endanger the project’s success.

Kotter (2005) states that it is often argued that major change is impossible unless the head of the organisation is an active supporter and that in successful transformation efforts the leadership coalition increases over time. However, he also states that “if a minimum mass is not achieved early in the effort, nothing much worthwhile happens” (Kotter, 2005, p.6). According to Leonard-Barton & Deschamps (1998), managers are usually presumed to influence the extent to which innovations are adopted and used by their staff. The level to which management influence is perceived varies due to staff’s individual characteristics such as task-related skills and whether staff are high or low performing.

They recommend that implementation of innovations should be viewed by management as a two-step process. The first step is the provision and advertising of an adequate infrastructure to support the innovation and when this is complete, attention should be focussed on motivating later adopters, who they identified as much as half of the users. Providing access is not enough as these users will await a managerial message (Leonard-Barton & Deschamps 1998). This strategy for using managers to influence adoption of technology is one that has the potential to add authority to a new technology and encourage interaction with social technologies (Samuel, 2010).

Change management and technology adoption research has also shown that how and where managers introduce new ideas and technologies into an organisation are critical for ultimate success (Brown et al., 2007). The networks managers within the organisation help to spread awareness of a new technology and helps to encourage collaboration through increased visibility and influence for contributors. However despite the benefits of management interaction with a new technology challenges still exist. Some managers may not fully appreciate the benefits of social technologies and may lack knowledge of social networking tools. The adoption of a new technology could also be seen as a risk to existing work processes or as an additional chore (Miles, 1997) thereby increasing the chance of rejection of the new technology. This leads us into a review of technology acceptance and the factors that can impede or promote acceptance of a new technology.

2.6 Technology Acceptance

As one of the most mature streams of information systems, technology acceptance has a wide range of framework models which can be useful when applied to research within this area (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Technology acceptance plays a key role in the successful adoption of any software or system within an organisation. Understanding each individual’s acceptance levels and their use of technology is vital during the introduction of any new IT implementation (Davis et al., 1989). Research in this area aims to define the key organisational factors and human characteristics that
have an impact on the adoption of new technologies. In order to inform the current research a study of the main theories of acceptance and their models was conducted.

Collaboration theory is another key area for this study, in particular the research outlined by Brown et al. (2010) which gives a basis for extending the model to include situational characteristics. Their framework is closely aligned to the research undertaken in this study. Critical mass depicted by Oliver et al. (1985) and the influence it may have on affecting technology acceptance is finally examined, to complete the effects which contribute towards technology adoption.

2.6.1 **Technology Acceptance Model**
The ability to predict adoption levels can be measured by an individual's intentions (Davis, 1989), and these intentions can be explained by a list of factors. The majority of research carried out within the area of technology acceptance originates from Davis’ Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). The TAM model is derived from principles outlined in the field of social psychology, and is adapted and based upon the Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) model established by Fishbein & Arjen (1975).
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The model is centred on two main characteristics, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use, which result in system usage and the adoption or rejection of a technology by an individual. The perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness of new technology by its intended users plays a key role on how well the technology is successfully embedded into an organisation. Davis (1989, p.320) describes perceived usefulness as “the degree in which a person believes that using a particular system would enhance his or her job performance”.

The perceived usefulness of an ESN can be attributed to an individual’s reaction as to whether they feel the platform benefits them in a number of aspects including gaining quicker access to information and feeling better connected with colleagues. It also reflects the perception as to
whether an individual feels the ESN creates a more collaborative environment and better communication within teams and across the whole organisation. Davis (1989, p.320) later describes perceived ease of use as “the degree to which a person believes that using a particular system would be free of effort”. Acknowledging the competing demands on individuals can help structure the introduction of new technologies.

2.6.2 Unified Theory of Acceptance and the Use of Technology
The other prominent model within the study of technology acceptance is the Unified Theory of Acceptance and the Use of Technology (UTAUT) developed by Venkatesh et al. (2008). The formation of UTAUT was created through the integration of eight distinct models of technology acceptance and its use. It is more specifically an extension of the research carried out within TAM with the introduction of two new characteristics, social influence and facilitation conditions which they describe as key predictors in adoption of technology.
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Fig. 2.2 Venkatesh et al. (2003) UTAUT Model

The principles of UTAUT are based on the use of the predictors of social influence and facilitating conditions as well as characteristics of perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness. These principles are defined within TAM and outline four key predictors that form the basis of the model. They are listed as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence and facilitating conditions.

Performance expectancy is based around the concept of perceived usefulness discussed within TAM and looks at how a new technology is seen to enhance a user’s productivity which results in
achieving performance goals. Effort expectancy relates to perceived ease of use and focuses on how the user sees the technology as being free of effort. Social influence investigates the perceived importance a user places on how others view an individual’s use of the technology. Finally, facilitating conditions involves the support provided for the new system and the resources which are made available.

These concepts inform the research into ESNs, and help structure an investigation into the perceived ease an individual feels when beginning to use social collaboration tools within an organisational setting. However, these theories focus mainly on individual adoption of technology rather than group or community adoption which is relevant to ESNs. To further explore this we will look at collaboration information technology theory.

2.6.3 Collaboration Information Technology
As discussed, UTAUT and TAM are both general models within the area of technology acceptance and they are used as the foundations for most research within this field. Although they can be applied to a wide range of different technologies and situations, they are more focussed on an individual’s adoption of a technology. A key aspect of social technologies is the community feeling users have therefore perceived use of a social technology is fundamentally different. In this situation decision making requires interdependent effort as part of a group which is jointly coordinated (Shen et al., 2013). As ESNs need to be adopted by a group in order to become worthwhile and perceived as successful, it is important to look at collaboration information technology theory.

According to Dennis et al. (2003) the term “collaboration technology” was first published by Olsen & Olsen (1991). Collaboration technology is designed to enable the communication, collaboration and cooperation of a group of knowledge workers at different places and times. The situational factors that influence the adoption of collaboration technology for both an individual and within a group have been categorised into four distinct categories: technology, individual and group, task, and situational (Dennis et al., 2001; Fjermestad & Hiltz 1998; 2000, Brown et al., 2010).

Dennis et al. (1998) outline a model depicting how these factors impact on technology use. The outcomes relate to work performance and job satisfaction as both of these are seen as influencing factors for technology adoption.
One model, developed by Brown et al. (2010), aims to predict collaboration technology use. By integrating prior research from both technology adoption and collaborative technology the authors use the UTAUT model as a basis and combine it with the four factors described above. According to Brown et al. (2010) the UTAUT model doesn’t imply an understanding when it comes to adoption of collaboration technology. Their research focuses on modifying the UTAUT model to incorporate collaboration technology use, something they have highlighted as not applicable to the complete UTAUT model discussed by Venkatesh et al., (2008). The study concentrates on previous research based on the idea that to understand the key factors in adoption of collaboration information technology (an umbrella term which incorporates enterprise social networks), you need to focus on the theories which involve situation in use (Dennis et al., 2001; Fjermestad & Hiltz, 1998, 2000).

This tailored model introduces factors from collaboration theory and associates them to those discussed within UTAUT to “understand how situational factors influence the ultimate decision to adopt and use collaboration technology” (Brown et al., 2010, p. 14). As part of the research, it is outlined that although these situational factors are not directly involved in affecting adoption, they influence the key predictors in the UTAUT model, which in turn have a direct influence on the adoption of new technology. Thus, it is determined that UTAUT acts as an intermediary in which these situation characters are able to influence adoption in use (Brown et al., 2010).
Socially derived characteristics such as social presence and quick feedback take on greater importance when adoption involves ‘social’ technologies (Fulk, 1993; Dennis et al., 2008). These are not applicable to other forms of technology acceptance but for research into ESNs it is important to investigate their impact. Furthermore the moderator of ‘voluntariness of use’ within the UTAUT model cannot be applicable to collaborative technologies, specifically in relation to enterprise social networks (Brown et al., 2010). It is also noted that social influence and facilitating conditions within the UTAUT model represent external influences, therefore should not impact on the collaborative technology factors included. Instead the model includes task and situational factors (Brown et al., 2010).

The choice of collaborative technology can typically be attributed back to research involving social presence theory, media richness theory and the task closure model. Social presence, immediacy and concurrency are identified as three specific characteristics which can be associated to collaborative technology by using the theories described (Brown et al., 2010).

**Technology Characteristics**

Research conducted on distance learning through communications technology addresses how this form of interaction creates an entirely different social climate to that of a physical classroom (Gunawardena, 1995). The research is based on social presence theory derived by Short et al. (1976)
in which it is suggested that interactions through collaborations technology, differ from those which occur face-to-face due to how non-verbal and non-word cues like facial expressions, posture, gestures and physical presence are perceived.

Short et al. (1976) argue that the more of these non-verbal and non-word cues a collaborative technology can facilitate, the greater level of social presence a user experiences, and therefore increases their likelihood of adoption. These cues are more visible in technology which provides a combination of audio and video communication, less perceptible on just audio and least of which through text only communication.

Immediacy of communication refers to the time it takes for a collaboration technology to enable an individual to communicate with others (Rice, 1987; Straub & Karahanna, 1998). The task closure model focuses on media selection by arguing that an individual will choose to use a collaborative technology based on their ability to communicate with another user and achieve a desired task which they have set out to complete (Straub and Karahanna, 1998).

The ability of an ESN and personal social media platforms to provide a user with immediate access to information that is made available on a public forum, makes this element of the model highly significant when researching its acceptance.

**Individual and Group Characteristics**

Individual and group characteristics are important regarding the adoption of collaborative technology as different individuals and groups have different needs (Dennis et al., 2001). General demographic factors like gender and age are always important hence their inclusion as moderators within the UTAUT aspect of the model but for collaborative technology in particular, different characteristics take on greater significance. Individual characteristics of technology experience, self-efficacy and the group characteristic of familiarity with other users are prominent factors which affect adoption (Brown et al., 2010).

Technology experience relates to an individual’s ability and understanding of how to use a specific technology. When new technology is introduced, satisfaction and job performance tend to decrease as an individual acquires the new skills required (Dennis & Garfield, 2003). During the period of change when introducing a new technology, an individual relies on past experiences with similar technologies by using a mechanism termed ‘anchoring’ to help with the adoption process (Venkatesh, 2000). It is suggested that over time as an individual becomes more accustomed to the technology, the level of acceptance increases and job performance improves (Dennis & Garfield, 2003).

Computer self-efficacy is defined as the belief an individual has in their own ability to use technology to complete a task (Compeau & Higgins, 1995). There has been a lot of research evident within this area which shows that individuals with higher levels of computer self-efficacy are more likely to perceive technologies to be easier to use (Venkatesh, 2000; Venkatesh & Davis, 1996).

Familiarity with working with other individuals involved in a group is also important in improving effectiveness, efficiency and job satisfaction. The more familiar individuals become with each other, the greater the understanding which in turn reduces uncertainty through the development of social norms (Dennis & Garfield, 2003).
The following descriptions outline the main items to be aware of which can negatively affect technology adoption.

**Task Characteristics**

Task is one of the main characteristics affecting adoption due to the impact it can have on performance (Dennis et al., 1988). It is more specific than the other factors discussed as part of collaborative technology as it involves a particular task which is carried out using a certain technology. A task which is perceived as important for one technology might not be applicable to another type of collaborative technology. Dennis et al. (2003) argue that instead of designing a model with a complete set of tasks it is better to select a task which is relevant to the particular form of collaborative technology which is being researched.

**Situational Characteristics**

Situational characteristics describe the context in which collaborative technology is implemented and the different factors which are involved (Dennis et al., 1988). These factors can involve both the influence of co-workers and the environment that they are working within. These factors impact on social influence which directly affects an individual’s intention to use a collaborative technology (Taylor & Todd, 1995). Brown et al. (2010) discuss how both colleagues and management should be considered key regarding adoption towards new technology because if both groups believe an individual should be using it and their opinion is considered important, they are more inclined to do so. Situational characteristics involving the environment can comprise of multiple different influences including organisational culture, encouragement towards using new technology and incentives for users (Bajwa et al., 2005).

Facilitating conditions represent the situational factors which assist in the process of an individual embracing a new technology. Based on research into situational factors, the main environmental factors can be grouped into two distinct categories: resource facilitating and technology facilitating conditions (Brown et al., 2010). Resource facilitating refers to the capital spend and existing infrastructure available to the organisation while the technology facilitation refers to compatibility issues. As discussed by Taylor & Todd (1995), as resources and technology support offered to an individual increases, so does the perception of available facilitating conditions.

**2.7 Critical Mass Impact**

Critical mass refers to “the idea that some threshold of participants or actions has to be crossed before a social movement explodes into being” (Oliver et al., 1985, p.523). The theory which is based under the constructs of social science is centred on the principle that the benefits of a system will only be adopted if there is a viable active community which stimulates interaction thereby generating collaboration. Failure to reach this threshold can instead create further communication and coordination barriers which has a negative impact on the technology.

Additional research into this area validates the importance of critical mass in recognising the theory as the key in achieving successful adoption of collaborative technologies (Markus & Connolly, 1990). When compared to productivity tools like databases or word processors, the benefit of using a social
technology is only evident when a critical mass of people engage in order to collaborate on work projects (Lou et al., 2000). The difficulty in terms of critical mass theory is how to measure when the threshold for a given platform or technology has been reached (Markus, 1990). Perceived critical mass, a term devised by Lou et al. (2000), focuses on the perception of this threshold and how a user identifies that it has been achieved.

This opinion may not reflect reality as an “individual may develop this perception from channels other than direct observation of usage” (Lou et al., 2000, p. 94). The perception can be created for a potential user from discussions or announcements relating to the technology or alternatively from the potential adopters generating these discussions which therefore creates this perception. However this occurs, it is a vital aspect of the adoption process (Ibid).

This observation can be attributed to the social influence aspect involved in the adoption of new technologies discussed in the UTAUT model. It refers specifically to the contribution of others within an individual’s social environment which directly impacts on a potential adopter to new technology.

2.8 Implementation Strategy

The importance of organisational strategy and the impact it can have regarding the successful adoption of social technologies has been explored by Guinan et al. (2014). The study is based on the “provide and pray” strategy discussed by Gartner (2013) as part of their research on social initiatives. It shows that organisations who implement this strategy yield a success rate of just 10% in relation to user adoption.

The research finds that organisations who prove successful in jumpstarting new social technologies have implemented one of three strategies. These strategies are outlined as follows:

1. Young Experimenters: typically younger college graduates new to the organisation.
2. Corporate Entrepreneurs: this group ranges from 5-15 years’ experience, have greater connections, creditability and influence at both higher and lower levels.
3. Enlightened Executives: these have the greatest status to engage others, are open-minded towards change although generally less tech-savvy than the other two groups.

The authors go on to discuss how numerous organisations treat collaboration as a platform decision rather than a solution to a particular problem. It is stated however, that whatever strategy is selected, it must have a clear and compelling purpose from the outset in order to achieve successful implementation of the social technology. (Guinan et al., 2014)

2.8.1 Manager’s adoption of technology

A study of Hewlett-Packard employees’ usage of internal social media at work found that managers’ attention to submitted content plays an important role in motivating employees to contribute to enterprise social networking (Brzozowski et al., 2009; Wang & Kobsa, 2009). They suggested that managers should lead by example in embracing internal social media, and that by being visible they would encourage employees’ participation. According to Wang & Kobsa (2009) managers who lead by example will put peer pressure on employees to contribute content.
In terms of barriers to adoption, Yammer has significant limitations that could impede broader adoption and overall efficacy: the noise-to-value paradox (Zhang et al., 2010). The researchers found a high correlation between the ranked answers of “is Yammer useful to me?” and “How often do you find relevant information on Yammer?” Although Yammer provides groups and following functionality to handle the paradox they state that these capabilities are imperfect and many users are unfamiliar with them (Ibid).

In terms of motivation, Leftheriotis & Giannokos (2014) found that both utilitarian (the degree to which employees perceive using social media to be a useful and effective means) and hedonistic (the degree to which employees perceive using social media to be a fun and emotionally stimulating experience) values influence employees to use more social media for their work. DiMicco et al. (2008) analyse user behaviour and their interviews presents the case that professionals use internal social networking to build stronger bonds with their weak ties in the organisation and to reach out to employees they do not know. These findings agree with Wellman’s (2008) theory discussed above, that the sparsely knit proliferation of computer networks has facilitated the development of networked societies that are loosely bound.

The research conducted by Zhang et al. (2010) on the use of Yammer in a large corporation reported user benefits of staying aware about what others were working on and making new connections, which they saw as being closely correlated to DiMccoo’s (2008) findings regarding weak tie theory.

This research forms a foundation for examining Yammer from a number of different standpoints. Yammer’s core functionality and layout, including the look, feel and ease of navigation will be focused on, along with the characteristic of perceived ease of use of the tool by examining the correlation between Facebook and Yammer to discover whether prior exposure and familiarity with Facebook increases adoption rates of Yammer. According to Skeels & Grudin’s (2009) study of workplace use of Facebook and LinkedIn in Microsoft, the authors suggest that social networking software will be most useful for people actively forming social networks. These ‘people’ are identified as young people as well as new employees. Morris & Venkatesh (2000) show that as people age, the importance to them of assistance to enable technology use increases. Venkatesh et al. (2003) argue that individuals with greater experience of a technology are more able to seek and find assistance.

In addition, two distinct influences which impact on perceived adoption levels, work colleagues and management, will be assessed. Firstly, through analyses of how these relationships are moderated by a user’s age, gender, experience and the voluntariness of the technology. Secondly, by examining how social influence can influence an individual when adopting a new technology. The inclusions of the social aspect in the analysis supports the wider research conducted in this study and enables the researchers gauge the importance of external influences on an individual when adopting a new technology such as Yammer.
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction
Research is “a process of systematic inquiry that is designed to collect, analyse, interpret, and use data to understand, describe, predict, or control an educational or psychological phenomenon or to empower individuals in such contexts.” (Mertens, 1998, p.2)

The research being undertaken for this study deals with social engagement, technology adoption, and change management. To depict the research approach, this chapter will give the motivation for the research design and implementation.

3.1.1 Research Aims and Questions
This study will examine and evaluate the level to which Yammer is used within the organisations studied. The research focuses on the challenges of introducing an enterprise social network into four organisations. It was from this main objective that the primary research question was developed. This research question provides the principal structure for the research at each stage of this study.

The primary research question is:

- An examination of an Enterprise Social Network, Yammer, in an Irish context analysing the factors which influence its acceptance, perception, social influence and implementation.

The primary research question is informed by an investigation into the following research areas:

- **Experience:** The amount of technical, organisational and social networking experience acknowledged by an individual will impact on the adoption levels Yammer as a collaborative tool.
- **Social Influence:** The use of Yammer by peers encourages its adoption and engagement amongst new users of the technology, and the number of people using the technology is a major contributing factor in relation to social engagement online.
- **Management:** A proactive contribution by managers encourages employees’ adoption of Yammer and increases employee engagement.
- **Access Flexibility:** The ability to access Yammer on multiple devices from any location and the immediacy of access to information will encourage interaction.
- **Communication:** The level and clarity of internal communications regarding the enterprise social network directly affects user participation.

3.2 Research Planning and Design
The research design of a study provides the overall structure to the study, bringing all the elements of the research together (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005, p. 85). When designing the research, the researcher must consider the aims and the research questions of the study; this focuses the study, calling for the collection of different types and interpretations of data. Following on from this, the practical elements of the study must be considered, such as issues related to the availability of data, collection, interpretation, and timeframes (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005, p. 87; Booth et al., 2008, p. 32).
The adoption of Yammer is the main focus of this study. In order to gain comprehensive insight into the use and acceptance of Yammer in Ireland, a variety of focused data needed to be gathered. The authors identified that in order to obtain as complete a view of Yammer use as possible, a mixed method approach would best serve the requirements of the study. This approach will be discussed in more detail further in this chapter.

3.3 Research Methodologies

3.3.1 Quantitative vs Qualitative Research

The qualitative versus quantitative paradigm has been the subject of much debate within the academic community for many decades, resulting in the concept of the ‘paradigm wars’ (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 14). Both sides believe their own paradigms as the purist standard in research making a decision on which research paradigm to choose difficult for the researcher. Some traditionalists, such as Guba (1990, p. 81) have argued that “accommodation between the paradigms is impossible” and therefore they are incompatible (Smith, 1983; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The result is that arguments for and against the two paradigms have resulted in two very different research cultures. Quantitative research is concerned with hard data coming from the study allowing for generalisations; whereas qualitative research is interested in the subjects personal experiences with the intent of gathering rich data and making focused observations (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 14). While similarities exist between quantitative and qualitative research approaches such as the collection and analysis of data, the formation of one or more hypotheses, and the review of existing literature, the processes associated with the approaches are often carried out in different ways, resulting to very different research methods (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 94).

The research methods therefore are defined based on their ontology, the relationship between the researcher and what is being examined, and the process of the research itself. The qualitative paradigm is concerned with gathering rich data to form a deep understanding of the research topic; whereas quantitative studies are more concerned large data sets that allow the research form broad generalisations in relation to the research subject.

3.3.2 Qualitative research

Qualitative research is interested with the views and personal beliefs views of the subjects sampled and takes into account the values of the respondent. This research technique is concerned with personal perceptions as opposed to statistical analysis. According to some proponents, qualitative research is more subjective and Merrian (1998, pp. 19-20 cited in Creswell 1994, p. 145) has noted that there are six assumptions of qualitative research designs. Merrian’s theories state that qualitative research is the “primary instrument” for collecting data and that the researchers are interested primarily with “process” and “meaning” rather than products or broad generalisations. In qualitative research, the researcher becomes involved in the fieldwork, and observes or records behaviour in order to gain understanding and meaning. Therefore the practice of qualitative researchers is to build rich pictures from concepts, hypotheses, ideas and theories.
As communication is key for this type of research there is an element of interpretation on the part of the researcher. Any biases the researchers may have, or strong values they hold, are required to be stated explicitly from the beginning to ensure objective results (Creswell, 1994, p. 147). The qualitative researcher must “purposefully select informants (or documents or visual material) that will best answer the research question. No attempt is made to randomly select informants” (Creswell, 1994, p. 148). The main purposes of this approach is to answer questions about the complex nature of research subject, to establish relationships that exist and determine the ideas and assumptions that inform the respondents’ view of the world and of the topic being explored. With this in mind the qualitative researcher needs to recognise that experiences are individual, and must try to understand the subject from the participants’ point of view (Basit, 2003, p. 143; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005, p. 94).

### 3.3.3 Quantitative research

Quantitative research focuses on the collection of statistics that allows the researcher to analyse, interpret and develop conclusions. Quantitative researchers are concerned with collection of facts in order to study the relationship of one set of facts with another (Bell, 2005, p. 7). By concentrating the research techniques on numbers, the research drawn can prove very valuable as they are seen as concrete facts. According to Balnaves & Caputi (2001, p.29) quantitative research requires “evidence that is observable and testable”. As it focuses on measurable data this approach typically falls under the positivist paradigm with research often being carried out in experimental settings. Quantitative researchers aim to measure the experience or reality that exists, independent of their own understanding of it. However this view and measure of reality has been referred to as naïve, as it can result in the measurement of conditions that do not truly reflect actual reality, a typical characteristic of positivist research.

Taking this into account, the researcher must design the study in a way that tries to avoid any distortion of results. Reliability and authenticity should be carefully considered when the study is being designed in order to have a representative sample population and remove any bias that may exist. Quantitative research, by its very nature, believes that reality can be measured therefore the researcher must take time to ensure this approach is a valid one (Creswell, 1994, p. 116). These issues will be discussed in greater detail further in the chapter.

### 3.3.4 The mixed method paradigm

According to Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004, p.17) the mixed method paradigm is “the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study”. This combined approach is referred to as the third research paradigm (Collins et al., 2006). Referring to the debate that continues on which paradigm is best, Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004) note that the mixed method approach can offer a logical and practical alternative that is less ridged in its approach. The choices offered to the researcher by opting for a mixed method design mean that the suggested weaknesses of the quantitative and qualitative approaches can be overcome (Snape & Spencer, 2003).
Both the quantitative and qualitative approaches have distinguishing characteristics, many of which are not mutually exclusive. Both techniques are experimental and aim to answer the research questions through a description of the data that has been collected. By integrating the techniques of both methods the researcher has more scope to better understand the concept being explored (Creswell, 1994, p. 177; Neill, 2007). This approach offers “great promise for practicing researchers who would like to see methodologists describe and develop techniques that are closer to what researchers actually use in practice” (Johnson & Onwuegubuzie, 2004, p. 15). Therefore, the mixed method approach aims to avoid any weaknesses that exist in either of the methods while maximising on the strengths of both.

The nature of the mixed method paradigm can take several forms (Creswell, 1994; Johnson & Onwuegubuzie 2004). The mixed model and the mixed method approach are outlined by Johnson & Onwuegubuzie (2004). The mixed model approach uses both qualitative and quantitative techniques throughout the research process. The mixed method approach breaks the qualitative and quantitative techniques into different phases in the research study. For the purposes of this study the researchers have used the mixed-method design.

Once the decision to use the mixed-method design was made the researchers needed to decide on whether to equally balance the paradigms or give one more importance over the other. The other decision was to conduct the research phases concurrently or sequentially. No matter which method is chosen, the research must fully integrate all relevant findings at some point in the study. If the study is carried out sequentially, the findings from one may inform the next phase. If, on the other hand, the study is carried out concurrently, the researcher must amalgamate the findings at the point of analysis and interpretation.

This study utilised both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Due to the additional data received from the quantitative approach it would be true to say that it is the more dominant approach in the study, while the qualitative techniques aim to add context and depth to the overall picture. The research was carried out concurrently.

### 3.3.5 Survey Questionnaire

According to Denscombe (2010), questionnaires are most effective for working with large numbers of respondents in diverse locations. As it is hoped to capture the views and experiences of Yammer users across four large organisations, an online questionnaire was deemed the most appropriate method of data collection. SurveyMonkey was the chosen online survey service provider. The criteria for participating in the survey was prior use of Yammer therefore only existing Yammer users or those individuals who had a Yammer profile in the past were invited to complete the questionnaire online. No individual could participate in the survey more than once which ensured results were as representative as possible. A total of 172 respondents submitted the survey from across the four organisations. A copy of the survey questions are available in Appendix A.
3.3.6 **Interviews**
In order to gain a deeper insight into why and how Yammer was implementing in the organisations, a number of one-to-one semi-structured interviews were scheduled with key individuals directly involved in the implementation of Yammer. The interviews were structured around seven areas, as follows:

- Appetite for change
- Collaboration
- Purpose / goal of ESN
- Launch
- Usefulness
- Ongoing communications
- Success / future plans for ESN

All interviews were recorded and transcribed. A copy of the interview questions are available in Appendix B.

3.4 **Main Research Themes**
In order to examine the use and levels of adoption of Yammer within the organisations being examined it was decided to structure the research and analysis by using the Brown *et al* (2010) research model. This model looks at technology acceptance from a collaboration technology perspective, and as such is deemed, the most pertinent of all the technology adoption models to this study.

As discussed in the literature review, Brown *et al.* (2010) incorporate four key factors which relate to collaborative technologies into the UTAUT model introduced by Venkatesh *et al.* (2003). These include technology, individual and group, task and situational.

The ‘Superiors’ entity as discussed in the Brown *et al* model refers to the influence management has on user adoption of technology.

One of the core areas of the Brown *et al.* research is to investigate the impact internal communication and support has on the levels of acceptance.

‘Critical mass’ is an environmental characteristic that can influence the levels of adoption within an organisation. The perception of critical mass by users may have a positive influence on adoption.

3.4.1 **Experience**
The amount of technical, organisational and social networking experience demonstrated by an individual will impact on the adoption levels Yammer as a collaborative tool.

- **Hypothesis 1:** Facebook experience will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.
Determining technology experience is one of the key factors when implementing a new system or software into an organisation. The ‘anchoring’ process as discussed by (Venkatesh, 2000) is concerned with the dependency, to some respect that an individual places on previous experiences with similar technologies during the adoption phase.

It is therefore argued that an individual’s familiarity with other popular forms of social media should influence and encourage their adoption such that the individual’s perception of both Yammer’s usefulness and ease of use will be positively influenced.

The research goes into more depth looking at the similarities between Facebook and Yammer. As highlighted by Alarifi & Sedera (2013), although both platforms are functioning social networks, networks such as Yammer are struggling to be adopted by employees. One of main objectives of the research is to examine this statement in more detail by using the four organisations being investigated. Facebook is used as a specific example of social media to test the affect if any, prior exposure to the platform has on acceptance levels of Yammer.

- **Hypothesis 2**: Computer self-efficacy will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.

The greater the belief an individual has in their own technical ability, described as computer self-efficacy, the more the individual should perceive new technologies more favourably in terms of how easy they find it to use (Venkatesh, 2000; Venkatesh & Davis, 1996). This survey will examine an individual’s computer self-efficacy and the impact it has on their adoption of Yammer.

- **Hypothesis 3**: Individuals with less years’ experience within the organisation will be more influenced by social engagement leading to a greater intention to use Yammer.

In Skeels & Grudin’s (2009) study of workplace use of Facebook and LinkedIn they suggest that social networking software will be most useful for people actively forming social networks, whom they identify as young people, as well as new employees. Social influence is concerned with the perceived importance a user places on how others view their use of technology. We suggest that employees who are newer to the organisation will be more likely to use Yammer as they wish to be seen to be engaging with the new technology and building social networks.

### 3.4.2 Social Influence

The use of Yammer by peers encourages its adoption and engagement amongst new users of the technology, and the number of people using the technology is a major contributing factor in relation to social engagement online.

- **Hypothesis 4**: Perceived reach of critical mass threshold will positively influence the intention to use Yammer.

As discussed by Lou *et al.* (2000), social technologies such as Yammer only become effective when they are used by a critical mass of people. Reaching a perceived threshold of users can vary between different individuals, but it is a key factor which can determine their choice on whether to use a
technology. The research will therefore test the influence perceived critical mass has on the adoption of Yammer by an individual.

- **Hypothesis 5:** The use of Yammer by colleagues will positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer

The influence of co-workers, as discussed by Brown et al. (2010), is outlined as being fundamental in an individual’s acceptance of new technology. Yammer, being a social technology makes the influence of others even more vital in the adoption process due to the large amount of interaction involved.

### 3.4.3 Management

A proactive contribution by managers encourages employees’ adoption of Yammer and increases employee engagement on the social network. The survey focuses on three categories to investigate the influence colleagues, line managers and senior management have on an individual’s adoption towards Yammer.

- **Hypothesis 6:** The use and encouragement of Yammer by line managers will positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer

Similar to colleague influence, Brown et al. (2010) outline how management can play a key role in affecting an individual’s position on using a new technology. The encouragement and active use of the technology by direct managers could potentially be a contributing factor towards whether employees decide to use it or not.

- **Hypothesis 7:** Active contribution on Yammer by senior management will positively influence the use of Yammer for individuals.

The research distinguishes between both, line management and senior management. In regards to senior management, the visibility of senior management engagement with Yammer, including their active contribution, could be a positive factor for individuals who are contemplating engaging on the network.

The survey has questions for both groups and examines the influence they can both have.

### 3.4.4 Access Flexibility

The ability to access Yammer on multiple devices from any location and the immediacy of access to information will encourage interaction on the platform.

- **Hypothesis 8:** Speed of access to information will positively influence the perceived usefulness of Yammer.

Immediacy of communication is one of the fundamental aspects for any collaborative technology as discussed by (Straub & Karahanna, 1998), it is mentioned that an individual is likely to choose a
technology that allows them to achieve effective communication with others and complete desired tasks. This research aims to gauge an individual’s response as to how effective they find Yammer in terms of accessing information from both a personal and team perspective.

- **Hypothesis 9:** The use of mobile devices will increase an individual’s activity on Yammer.

The ‘task characteristic’, as referenced by Dennis *et al.* (1988), seems to vary more than any other aspect of acceptance models due to it being most specific to the technology which is being researched. As stated by Dennis *et al.* (2003), it is best to focus on one particular task which best examines the performance and adoption of the technology and like their research, the model with focus on ‘Mobility’. The study will test the importance mobility plays on the performance of using Yammer and if those who use Yammer on a mobile device are more likely adopters than those who done.

### 3.4.5 Communication

The degree and clarity of internal communications that support the promotion of the enterprise social network directly affects user participation.

- **Hypothesis 10:** Structured internal communications positively influences the intention to use Yammer.

This research investigates the effect of facilitating conditions, such as user training, on user adoption levels of Yammer. Venkatesh & Morris (2000) show that as people age, the importance of assistance when introducing a new technology increases and Venkatesh *et al.* (2003) argue that individuals with greater experience of a technology are more able to seek and find assistance.
CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis and Findings

4.1 Introduction
This chapter presents the findings from both the survey and interviews that were conducted. The results are presented under the five themes that provide the principle structure for this study in order to answer the research question.

Hypothesis 1 is supported, highlighting that Facebook experience positively influences the perceived ease of use of Yammer. Hypothesis 2 is supported also as individuals with higher levels of computing skills found Yammer’s functionality easy to use.

Contrary to literature regarding the adoption of an ESN within an organisation, it was found that employees with more years’ experience within the organisation are more likely to be socially influenced. Therefore hypothesis 3 was not supported.

The role of social influence was supported in both hypotheses 4 and 5 as the perceived critical mass of active Yammer users by colleagues or teams was a contributing factor of an individual’s intention to use Yammer, as was the use of Yammer by colleagues.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 are supported as active encouragement from line managers and senior managers was seen to positively influence affect an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

Results from hypothesis 8 proved inconclusive. Despite respondents agreeing that Yammer can provide quick access to information and facilitate better communications, more research is required to determine whether this positive sentiment is sufficient to support the hypothesis.

Due to the low level of mobile users, hypothesis 9 could not be fully examined. Finally, when structured internal communications take place within an organisation, employees are more inclined to engage with the Yammer platform, therefore hypothesis 10 is supported.

4.2 Research Sample
The sample for this research study focused on Yammer users within four organisations.

Within Organisation A there was no official launch of Yammer however there are 115 active members representing approximately 14% of the staff population. A re-launch of the tool is planned for late in 2015.

Organisation B has approximately 28,000 employees all of whom have Yammer accounts created automatically when they join the organisation. A total of 4760 users within the organisation can be classed as active, the equivalent of 17% of the organisation.

Within Organisation C a total of 180 individuals have active Yammer accounts. This represents a total of 7% of the staff population.

Within Organisation D Yammer is not currently being actively used. A pilot was run in 2013 which had 90 users. This represented approximately 9% of employees within the organisation.
Engagement with the Yammer platform is defined as follows:

- Active users: those who have an account and responded positively to the survey question “Do you use Yammer”. This accounted for 84.7% (144/172) of respondents.
- Non active users: those who have an account and responded negatively to the survey question “Do you use Yammer”. This accounted for 15.3% (28/172) of respondents.

Before examining the survey results in detail a number of results are presented which represent general findings for the survey and which inform some of the subsequent analysis.

The gender balance of respondents was almost equal with 51.2% or 86 out of 168 being female, and 48.8% or 82 out of 168 being male.

The age profile for all respondents in the graph below shows that the majority of respondents (55.3%, 94/170) are in the 30-44 age range, followed by 31.2% in the 45-60 range (53/170) and 12.0% in the 18-29 range (22/170). Only one survey respondent was in the 60 and over range and this data was discounted as too small a sample to analyse.

Almost 50% of respondents work in an IT/IS role. This result needs to be considered when analysing the willingness to adopt a new technology. The assumption could be made that IT/IS workers are less resistant to technological change, more open to trying new tools, and have more of a propensity to usefully apply technologies.

In order to establish how the target population were accessing Yammer they were asked to choose web browser, mobile device, or both. The majority of respondents (76%) chose the “Web browser” option while 24% chose “Mobile device”.
The insights into the respondents, as outlined above, help to provide an introductory context to the following data analysis.

4.3 **Examination of Data**

4.3.1 **Experience**

**Hypothesis 1:** Facebook experience will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.

This hypothesis was tested by exploring the level to which survey respondents who use Facebook agree that it is easier to use Yammer because of familiarity with Facebook.

The responses to a number of survey questions were analysed which informed the results. The first question determined if respondents are using Facebook and a total of 74% (125/169) of respondents are using it. Examining the results across the organisations, Organisations C and D had results that were higher and lower than this total, with 88% (22/25) and 65% (11/17) of positive responses respectively.

The age profile of Facebook users was examined to investigate if these findings could be explained by differences in the age profile of users. Almost all 18-29 year olds 95.5% (21/22) use Facebook. The second largest group of users is those aged 30-44 (79.6% (74/93)) and the group with the least Facebook usage is the 45-60 age group (54.7%, (29/53)).

As the findings earlier in the report show in Fig. 4.1, the proportion of respondents in the 18-29 age group is 12.9% (22/170). Organisation C has a higher proportion of 18-29 year olds of 24% (6/25) than the total for all respondents, which is 12.9% (22/170). The opposite is true for Organisation D.
which has a lower proportion of 18-29 year olds (5.9%, 1/17). These results could therefore possibly explain the differences in the level of Facebook uptake across the organisations.

Survey participants were asked to rate how easy they found Facebook to use in the following areas: general navigation, personalising their newsfeed, searching for friends and signing up to groups.

The results show strong positive agreement that Facebook is easy to use across all areas. The highest negative response of “not at all” was 4.1% (5/123) for “personalising your newsfeed”, followed by “signing up to groups”, which was 1.6% (2/122). These responses also had the highest answers for the “slightly useful” category of 4.1% (5/123) and 6.6% (8/122) respectively.

The same question was put to Yammer users, and for this hypothesis the responses were filtered for Yammer users who also used Facebook. These responses were compared to the responses to the Facebook question and the outcome is shown in Fig. 4.3 The general trend is the same in that the majority of Yammer users also show strong positive agreement that the tool is easy to use across all areas.

![Fig. 4.3 Facebook/Yammer ease of use comparison](image)

For all but one of the areas, “personalising your newsfeed”, a higher percentage of Yammer users had a negative response of “not at all”. Both Facebook and Yammer score lowest in terms of ease of use for two types of functionality: “Personalising your newsfeed” and “Signing up to groups”.

When an average of the responses for the four areas is taken a clearer comparison can be made, as shown in Fig. 4.4 The percentage of respondents selecting the options “extremely easy” and “very easy” are higher for Facebook than Yammer and the reverse is true for the “moderately easy”, “slightly easy” and “not at all” options.
The main survey question used to test the hypothesis asked respondents to select their level of agreement to the statement: “It is easier to use Yammer because I am familiar with Facebook”. Exactly 50% (63/126) of those who answered the question agreed and a further 15.1% (19/126) strongly agreed giving a total of 65.1% of respondents agreeing that Facebook experience increases the effort expectancy of Yammer.

Respondents in Organisation A had the lowest level of agreement of 54.8% (34/62), while Organisation B had the highest level, 83.9% (26/31), to this statement. Organisations C and D had similar levels of agreement of 68.1% (15/22) and 63.6% (7/11) respectively.

Finally, a comparison was made between Facebook users and non-Facebook users regarding how easy they find Yammer to use. The results in Fig. 4.5 show that 52.4% of Facebook users find Yammer extremely or very easy to use, whereas the figure for non-Facebook users is 40.1%. The reverse is true for those who do not find it useful, with 2.3% of Facebook users and a higher relative proportion of non-Facebook users of 9.5% selecting the “not at all” option.
The findings support the hypothesis that Facebook experience positively influences the perceived ease of use of Yammer.

The next hypothesis examines user experience in terms of computer skills and whether users who rate their level of skill higher perceive Yammer to be easier to use than those who rate their skills lower.

**Hypothesis 2: Computer self-efficacy will positively influence the perceived ease of use of Yammer.**

This hypothesis was tested by exploring the level to which respondents who rated their computing skills as “advanced” found Yammer more easy to use than those who rated their skills as “intermediate” or “basic”.

The analysis first examined the levels at which the survey respondents rated their skills and the results to this question show that the majority of respondents, 61.3% (103/168), rated their skills as advanced with 36.9% (62/168) claiming to be at an intermediate level and a small percentage, 1.8% (3/168) rating their skills as basic.

A potential reason for a large proportion of respondents rating their computing skills highly can be suggested following an examination of the job functions of respondents. As discussed in the introduction to the research findings, almost 50% (48.2%, 82/170) of respondents work in an IT/IS role and would be expected to rate themselves more highly in terms of computing skills.

Of the respondents who work in IT/IS, 86.4% (70/81) rated their computer skills as advanced with the remaining 13.6% rating their skills as intermediate. The next highest group of respondents did not fall into the job classifications outlined and classed themselves as “Other”. This group rated their skills at a much lower level, with 33.3% (10/30) rating them as advanced and 66.7% (20/30) as intermediate.
As discussed in hypothesis 1, the perceived ease of use of Yammer was examined by asking survey participants how easy they find Yammer to use in terms of four areas; general navigation, personalising their newsfeed, searching for colleagues and managing membership of groups and the results show largely positive agreement that Yammer is easy to use across the four Yammer areas.

To explore the hypothesis the results for the ease of use of Yammer question were examined against the results of the computer skills question and the results are shown in Fig 4.6. The responses of “extremely” and “very” were aggregated to represent a positive response and those of “slightly” and “not at all” aggregated to represent a negative one.
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**Fig. 4.6 Ease of use of Yammer areas by computer skill level**

Respondents who rated their computer skills as “advanced” or “intermediate” have a higher positive response relative to negative response over all four Yammer areas. This is especially the case for those with advanced skills who respond positively 11 and 9 times higher than negatively for the “General navigation” and “Searching for colleagues” areas respectively.

Finally, an average was taken of the responses for the four areas and the results were examined against the level of computing skills of respondents. The results are shown in Fig 4.7. and there is a clear trend showing that respondents with advanced and intermediate skills perceive Yammer to be more useful than those with basic skills.
On average, 50% of respondents with basic skills find Yammer “not at all” useful, whereas this figure is only 6% and 2% for those with intermediate and advanced skills respectively.

Respondents with advanced skills have a 10% higher level of response (39%) to the “very easy” response than those with intermediate skills (29%), however those with intermediate skills have a slightly higher level (16% as against 13%) of “extremely easy” responses.

The results support the hypothesis that computer self-efficacy positively influences the perceived ease of use of Yammer.

The next hypothesis is the final one in the ‘Experience’ section and it explores whether individuals with less years’ experience within an organisation will be more influenced by social engagement leading to a greater intention to use Yammer.

**Hypothesis 3:** Individuals with less years’ service within the organisation will be more influenced by social engagement, leading to a greater intention to use Yammer.

This hypothesis was tested by exploring the influence colleagues, line managers and senior management have on an individual’s intention to use Yammer and the effect their years of organisational service and experience has on this intention.

To examine this proposition, the responses to two survey questions were studied to inform the results. The first survey question asks participants if they initially signed up to Yammer because “other colleagues are using it”. Of the respondents, 44.1% (74/168) answered positively to this question.

These results were then measured against the length of time the respondent was working within the organisation. A direct comparison was made between those who selected 1-5 years and the results for those who selected either 16-20 years or 20+ years.
Of the 80% (40/50) of respondents in the 1-5 years’ experience category who were using Yammer, 40% (20/50) responded that they initially joined because other colleagues were using Yammer.

For those in the 16+ years’ experience category, 89.6% (43/48) were using Yammer and 43.6% (21/48) said that they initially signed up to Yammer due to the fact that other colleagues using it.

At this point in the analysis there is not a significant difference between the two groups.

The second question used to evaluate the hypothesis asked survey respondents to rate their agreement with the following statement: “I would use Yammer more if colleagues were using it more”. For positive responses, colleague influence was 85.7% (144/172). These responses were then moderated by respondents’ years of service with their organisations.

As can be seen in Fig 4.8., for those with 1-5 years’ experience, 81.3% (39/48) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.

Comparing this with respondents in the 16+ years category, 89.6% (43/48) had positive responses, although there was a decrease of 14.6% of positive responses when examining just the “strongly agree” option.

These figures suggest that while there is a high level of agreement when both groups are compared, respondents with 1-5 years’ organisational experience are more certain in regards to the strength of their agreement.

Next the responses to “I would use Yammer more if managers were encouraging use” and “senior management were visibly using it” were analysed. There was overall agreement, with 76.4% (126/172) for line manager influence and 76.5% (127/172) for senior management influence.

For respondents with 1-5 years’ experience, who indicated that management influence would increase their Yammer activity, positive results were slightly lower when compared to the
respondents in the same years of service group but who cited colleague influence as a factor. For line manager and senior management influence, respondents in this group had agreement levels of 72.9% (35/48) and 73.5% (36/49) respectively.

A total of 77.8% (35/48) of respondents in the 16+ years of experience category agreed that line management would be an influence while 80% (36/48) stated that senior management would have a greater influence.

![Fig. 4.9 Manager/Senior management influence on Yammer use by organisational experience](image)

Having observed little difference in the level of positive agreement across line manager and senior manager influence, the strongly agree responses were examined. For respondents with 16+ years’ experience there was an increase of 8.7% compared to those with 1-5 years’ experience regarding line management influence. The equivalent analysis for senior management influence shows a 13.8% increase.

This would suggest that although both groups value the importance of colleagues, those with greater years’ experience within the organisation are more likely to be influenced by management over those with less years’ experience.

### 4.3.2 Social Influence

**Hypothesis 4:** Perceived reach of critical mass threshold will positively influence the intention to use Yammer.

As discussed in the literature, an individual’s perception of a critical mass of system users might not be an accurate reflection of the actual number of people who are actively using the system. If a respondent feels that their team or a significant number of other users across the organisation are
actively using Yammer, are they therefore more inclined to use it? Does an individual place greater importance on their team’s usage of Yammer or are they more influenced by the perception that the wider organisation is using it?

This hypothesis is closely related to Hypothesis 5 with more of a focus on a wider level across the entire organisation rather than the team. It is based on the perception an individual has in relation to the number of people using Yammer within the organisation, and if that perception is high, it increases their intention to use Yammer.

Organisation D implemented Yammer as part of a pilot project which was rolled out largely within the IT department and was not subsequently rolled out across the organisation. This eliminates the possibility of critical mass being examined within these conditions, therefore Organisation D is dismissed as part of the research for this hypothesis.

Of the remaining 155 respondents who answered the statement: “In my opinion, a significant number of employees within my organisation actively use Yammer”, 49% (75/153) answered positively, with only 9.2% (14/75) strongly agreeing with the statement.

When respondents are then divided into active and non-active Yammer users as defined in the introduction to this chapter there is a difference in the results. For non-active Yammer users, only 17.7% (3/17) answered positively to the statement as against 52.9% (72/136) of active Yammer users.

This could suggest that a positive perception of a critical mass increases an individual’s intention to use Yammer. Fig 4.10 illustrates the findings discussed above.

![Fig. 4.10 Critical mass perception by active/non-active Yammer users](image-url)
As part of the survey respondents were also asked how active they perceive their team or department to be on Yammer. These results were evaluated to see if there is a greater importance placed on a team’s use of Yammer compared to the organisation collectively.

A comparison was conducted on the results from the questions: “Is your team/department/function currently using Yammer?” and “In my opinion, a significant number of employees within my organisation actively use Yammer”. Responses from those who stated they did not know if their team was using Yammer and those who were undecided or neutral were dismissed.

Only one respondent from the 172 surveyed stated they were not using Yammer despite the fact that their organisation and their team were using it.

Fig 4.11 shows how the majority of non-active Yammer users have a negative perception towards the use of Yammer across the entire organisation.

![Perception of Yammer use - Teams & Organisations](image)

**Fig. 4.11 Perception of Yammer use – organisation/team comparison**

This would suggest that the positive perception of a critical mass of active Yammer users increases an individual’s intention to use it and those with this perception are most likely to be active users.

The next section of the findings for social influence will focus on the influence colleagues have on an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

**Hypothesis 5:** The use of Yammer by colleagues will positively influence an individuals’ intention to use Yammer.

This hypothesis examines the social influence of colleagues within an organisation and assesses if their use and adoption of Yammer is a factor that encourages others’ intention to use it, specifically focusing on an individual’s team. Respondents were questioned about the levels of Yammer
adoption within their own team or department, why they initially signed up, and if the increased use of Yammer by colleagues would influence their intention to use the social networking tool.

As discussed in the introduction section, 84.7% (144/172) of respondents who agreed to participate in the survey stated they were active users of Yammer.

In response to: “Is your team/department/function/ currently active on Yammer?” 60% (102/170) answered positively, 27.7% (47/170) answered negatively with the remaining 12.3% (21/170) selecting the option “I don’t know”.

When comparing active and non-active Yammer users, an increase in the use of Yammer within teams where respondents actively use the tool is shown. This distinction is represented in Fig 4.12.

![Fig. 4.12 Team Yammer use by active/non-active Yammer users](image)

Although there is a difference of 34.5% between those who answered positively within both active and non-active categories it cannot be assumed that this difference is solely related to the influence of other colleagues on their intention to use Yammer. Other factors could include the type of department the respondents work in, along with line manager encouragement and use which is discussed as part of Hypothesis 6.

The next question to be examined was “why did you initially sign up to Yammer?”. A total of 44.1% (74/168) of respondents stated that they did so because other colleagues were using the platform. This supports the suggestion that the influence of colleagues and their use of Yammer is an important factor in relation to an individual’s intention to use Yammer and one of the reasons behind them initially signing up.

When the results to this question are compared across all four organisations a different pattern begins to emerge. For Organisation B the influence of colleagues was lower in comparison to the
other organisations; however it was also the only one of the four where accounts were automatically created for employees. This could explain why the choice of “An account was automatically created for me by my organisation” was most popular answer for Organisation B. This doesn’t necessarily mean that colleague influence is any less important for Organisation B but instead could imply that it wasn’t the primary reason for joining initially.

The final question reviewed looked at colleague influence and the effect it can have on an individual’s intention to use Yammer. It was based on the results to the statement “I would use Yammer more if colleagues were using it more”. This had a positive response rate of 85.7% (144/169). This high level of agreement again suggests the importance respondents place on their colleagues being active on Yammer and how it can be a contributing factor towards their intention to use it.

Overall, the results show that colleagues use of Yammer and their influence was important for respondents in their decision to use Yammer.

The role of social influence seems to be significant in relation to an individual’s intention to use Yammer. Whether it is colleague influence within a team as covered in this hypothesis, or the perception of the entire organisation using it as discussed in hypothesis 4, it is clear that social influence has a positive effect on the adoption and use of Yammer.

The next research theme is management and it explores the influence of line managers and senior managers on an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

4.3.3 Management

**Hypothesis 6:** The use and encouragement of Yammer by line managers will positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

This hypothesis investigates the influence of line management on employees in relation to Yammer usage and if their encouragement and use are factors that influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

The research investigated if the encouragement and active use of Yammer by line managers increases both an individual’s and a team’s intention to use the tool. Firstly, respondents were divided into two categories depending on their response to the survey question: “Does your manager encourage use of Yammer?” A comparison was then made between these two categories to investigate the levels of active and non-active Yammer users within both. A further comparison was made to determine whether a respondent’s team is currently active on Yammer or not. An examination of the importance of how active a manager appears to be on Yammer is also conducted to see if this influences intention to use Yammer. Finally a combination of both factors is studied together to see the impact both have on an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

Over 29.4% (48/168) stated that their line manager encouraged the use of Yammer while the remaining 70.6% (115/168) said they were not encouraged to use Yammer.
Of the respondents who stated their manager encouraged use of Yammer, 83.3% (40/48) also said their manager used Yammer. When the same question was applied to the remaining 115 respondents whose managers did not encourage the use of Yammer, the results showed that just 18.3% (21/115) stated that their manager used Yammer. This suggests from the outset that managers who encourage the use of Yammer are more likely to also be users of it.

A comparison of those who stated they were encouraged by management and those who said they were not encouraged was also analysed to determine if this affected their use of Yammer. The results show that 95.4% (46/48) of respondents who were encouraged by their manager said they were currently using Yammer. Of those who said they weren’t encouraged to use Yammer by their manager, the number of Yammer users was lower at 79.1% (91/115).

These figures suggest that encouragement by management increases an individual’s intention to use Yammer as represented in Fig 4.13.

![Do you use Yammer?](image)

**Fig. 4.13 Manager influence on Yammer use**

In response to the question “Is your department/team currently active on Yammer?” of the group who were encouraged by management 95.4% (46/48) of respondents said their team was currently using the platform. For the group whose managers did not encourage the use of Yammer the response was 46.1% (53/115).

This suggests that encouragement by line managers increases not only an individual’s intention to use Yammer but also the intention of others within their department or team. These differences are shown in Fig. 4.14.
Next the research looked at whether a greater level of activity on Yammer by line managers could increase the frequency by which an individual not only checks Yammer but also how often they post to groups.

Respondents were divided into four categories; those with encouraging and active managers, encouraging but non-active managers, non-encouraging but active managers, and non-encouraging and non-active managers.

Active managers were defined based on responses to the question “How often does your manager post updates?” which examines the frequency in which a line manager posts to Yammer. Respondents who selected that their manager posted at least once a week or more were considered as having an active manager. Respondents who answered less frequently or never were considered as having a non-active manager.

The results to the question “How often do you check Yammer?” were then reviewed to see if encouragement by line managers increases the intention of an individual to check Yammer, and if an active contribution by line managers further increases this intention. The results in Fig. 4.15 indicate that although encouragement by line managers is likely to increase an individual’s intention to check Yammer, there is greater importance placed on the level of activity of the manager.

Fig. 4.15 below summarises these findings and demonstrates how managers who both encourage and actively use Yammer have the highest level of success in terms influencing others to check Yammer.
The results are then examined using the four categories to investigate if there is any differentiation in a respondent’s intention to post to groups on Yammer between each category.

The results follow a similar pattern to those seen in the analysis of how often users check Yammer in that individuals are more likely to post to groups if their manager encourages the use of Yammer and is actively using it. As seen in Fig 4.16, a total of 52.6% (21/40) of those with encouraging and active managers said they posted to a group at least once a week compared to just 6.1% (3/49) for those with non-encouraging managers as shown below. This again indicates that the active use and encouragement of Yammer by line managers will positively influence an individual’s intention to use Yammer.

**Fig. 4.15 Manager influence on frequency of checking Yammer**
Finally a breakdown by organisation is examined to see if encouragement or active use of Yammer by line managers is more prevalent within any of the organisations.

The 29.4% (48/168) of respondents who stated they were encouraged to use Yammer by their line manager is broken down by organisation. Fig. 4.17 shows that the majority of managers who encourage the use of Yammer are employed within Organisation B.

**Fig. 4.16 Manager influence on frequency of posting to groups on Yammer**

**Fig. 4.17 Organisational comparison of manager encouragement of Yammer use**
A similar trend exists when looking at the level of use by management within the organisations. Participation by management in Organisation B polled at 78.1% (32/41) which was a lot higher compared to 25.9% (22/85) for Organisation A, 28% (7/25) for Organisation C and 0% (0/17) for Organisation D. Organisation D was excluded at this point.

The findings earlier noted that encouragement and use by management increases both an individual and team’s intention to use Yammer. This would suggest that respondents from Organisation B would therefore answer more positively to questions regarding the use of Yammer. It should also show a higher level of activity when checking Yammer and a higher frequency of posting to groups.

A review of the responses to the questions discussed supports these findings. The table below details the responses to these questions categorised by organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Organisation A (out of 86)</th>
<th>Organisation B (out of 42)</th>
<th>Organisation C (out of 25)</th>
<th>Organisation D (out of 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you use Yammer?</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your department/team/function currently active on Yammer?</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often would you check Yammer?</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often would you post to groups on Yammer?</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1 Organisation comparison of Yammer usage*

To conclude, each question which references line management covered in the survey suggests that individuals are highly influenced by the encouragement and active use of management regarding Yammer, suggesting strong support for the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 7 continues with the theme of management by examining the influence senior management can have on the adoption and use of Yammer within the organisation. This will investigate how important individuals perceive senior management participation is on Yammer engagement. References to the interviews will also be made regarding management buy-in.

**Hypothesis 7:** Active contribution on Yammer by senior management will positively influence the use of Yammer for individuals.

This hypothesis is used to explore if the use of Yammer by senior management influences other employees’ use. It was tested using the survey and feedback from the interviews.

The survey asked participants to select a level of agreement for the following statement: “I would use Yammer more if senior management were visibly using it”.
The results were found to support the hypothesis. The graph below shows that 76.5% (127/166) of survey respondents agreed that they would use Yammer more, with 13.9% (23/166) undecided and 9.6% (16/166) disagreeing with the statement.

![I would use Yammer more if senior management were visibly using it:](image)

**Fig. 4.18 Senior management influence on Yammer use**

Respondents in all four organisations had a high level of agreement to the statement. Organisation C had the highest level of agreement (83.3% (20/24)) and the lowest disagreement (4.2% (1/24)). Organisation D had reverse findings with the lowest level of agreement of 56.3% (9/16) and the highest level of disagreement of 31.3% (5/16).

The interviewee from Organisation D suggested that a key benefit of Yammer is communication across hierarchies and that it could be used to “get conversations going between lots of disparate groups, disparate in both terms of their types of roles in work but [also] their geography and their place in the organisational hierarchy”. The interviewee indicated that there was no management buy-in to the use of Yammer, which had been approved by senior management, albeit with a sense of apathy about its implementation.

Whilst the majority of respondents in Organisation D agree that they would use Yammer more if senior management were using it, their level of agreement is over 30% lower than that of Organisation C, where there is a similar lack of management buy-in, according to feedback from the interviewee. The differential could possibly be explained by the sense of apathy of management being felt by some employees in Organisation D.

The interviewee from Organisation A suggested that the uptake of Yammer by senior management in their organisation had been insufficient to date and that management buy-in was generally at a low level. A benefit of Yammer was seen to be giving people the option to ask questions of senior management and breaking down traditional hierarchies, as it was felt that some employees thought that they shouldn’t talk to those at higher grades. The findings of the survey, where the second
highest level of respondents across the organisations (82.4% (70/85)) agreed that they would use Yammer more if senior management were using it, could suggest that employees may be keen to have the opportunity to communicate with employees in more senior positions via Yammer.

In contrast to the other three organisations, feedback from the interviewee from Organisation B suggests that there is a high level of engagement from senior management who are actively encouraged to contribute. All company leaders give an hour of their time twice a year to contribute to global ‘YamJams’, a term used to describe an online meeting held via Yammer where experts make themselves available to participate in discussions. The company CEO also blogs once a week on Yammer and invites employees across the organisation to engage in conversation.

The interviewee from Organisation B stated that one of the goals for choosing to implement Yammer was to “increase the access to our leadership population” and the interviewee believes that making access to the leaders easier is breaking down hierarchies.

However, Organisation B had the greatest number of “undecided/neutral” responses (17.1%, (7/41)) and was second highest in the “disagree” category (14.6%, (6/41)), which could suggest that respondents are unsure of or do not see advantage to be gained by the contribution of senior managers.

Overall the findings seem to generally support the hypothesis that active contribution on Yammer by senior management positively influences the use of Yammer for individuals. This is in line with the findings from Hypothesis 6 which also concluded that line managers can positively influence user engagement on Yammer by regularly contributing and encouraging use.

The next section of the findings examines whether getting access to information faster on Yammer has a positive effect on its perceived usefulness and whether using Yammer on a mobile device increases users’ level of activity.

4.3.4 Access Flexibility

**Hypothesis 8:** Speed of access to information will positively influence the perceived usefulness of Yammer.

This hypothesis was tested by asking a series of questions related to how quickly information could be accessed on Yammer. The aim was to examine the extent to which this influenced the perceived usefulness of the platform.

When asked if Yammer helps find answers to questions faster as shown in Fig. 4.19, 40.6% (69/170) of responses were positive and 11.7% (20/170) were negative. While this shows a greater positive response versus negative, a total of 47.7% (81/170) of respondents had “Undecided/Neutral” responses. To further explore these findings an analysis was conducted of responses to survey questions on specific Yammer tasks.
When asked if Yammer is a useful tool as shown in Fig 4.20, 66.3% (112/169) of respondents had positive replies while 5.9% (10/169) had negative responses, demonstrating greater positive than negative sentiment regarding the effectiveness of Yammer.

The level of perceived usefulness of Yammer changed when only the positive sentiment responses to the question “Yammer helps find answers to questions faster” were observed. Over 97% (67/69) responded positively when asked if they considered Yammer to be a useful tool.
Of those respondents who disagreed that Yammer facilitated faster answers to questions (40% (8/20)), an equal amount disagreed (40% (8/20)) that Yammer was a useful tool. Therefore, even where negative sentiment was recorded, there was not complete dismissal of the tool’s usefulness.

Where respondents had positive replies to “Yammer is a useful tool” and “Yammer helps me find answers to my questions faster”, 67.6% (46/68) also responded positively to the statement “Yammer helps my team communicate and collaborate more efficiently”.

When asked if Yammer facilitates better communication with co-workers, 66.1% (111/168) agreed and 10.7% (18/168) disagreed. As shown in Fig 4.21, where respondents responded positively to “Yammer helps me find answers to questions faster”, 88.4% (61/69) agreed that Yammer facilitates better communication with co-workers. Of users with negative responses, 40% (8/20) agreed that Yammer facilitated better communication with co-workers suggesting that speed of access to information is not a principal factor for employees when engaging on the Yammer platform. This renders the hypothesis inconclusive.

![Fig. 4.21. Speed of access comparison regarding facilitation of better communication on Yammer](image)

The next item explored survey respondents’ sentiment to the statement “I regularly find useful content and work-related information on Yammer”. For respondents with positive responses to “Yammer helps me find answers to my questions faster” 84% (58/69) agreed. For those who disagreed with “Yammer helps me find answers to my questions faster”, 15% (3/20) agreed that they regularly find useful content on Yammer as shown in Fig 4.22.
To conclude, respondents who stated they found access to information quicker had a higher level of agreement that Yammer is a useful tool.

Those respondents also responded positively that Yammer facilitates better communication with co-workers and enables them to regularly find useful content. However, where respondents did not find answers to questions faster, a certain number of respondents still agreed that Yammer facilitated better communications with co-workers and found useful content therefore further analysis would be required in order to conclusively prove or disprove this hypothesis.

The next hypothesis continues with the theme of access flexibility and concentrates on the impact of mobile devices.

**Hypothesis 9: The use of mobile devices will increase an individuals’ activity on Yammer.**

For the testing of this hypothesis, respondents were asked to select how often they checked and posted to groups within Yammer. To determine the effect mobile devices have on checking and posting to groups, the responses were divided into “Web browser” (Desktop/laptop), “Mobile device” (Smartphone/tablet) and “Both” (Web browser and mobile device) groupings. As noted in the introduction, 76.3% (129/169) of respondents accessed Yammer via “Web browser”, with a small percentage (1.2%, (2/169)) only using “Mobile device”, and 22.5% (38/169) using “Both”. It should be noted that due to the small number of respondents accessing Yammer within the group “Mobile device”, mobile only access to Yammer was discounted and results are drawn using the category “Both”.

As illustrated in Fig 4.23, when asked “How often would you check Yammer?” 3.3% (3/92) of respondents using only web browser check Yammer several times a day, 18.5% (17/92) a few times a week, with 17.4% (16/92) checking roughly once a week. Of the group “Both”, 18.4% (7/38) check...
Yammer several times a day, 44.7% (17/38) check a few times a week, with 18.4% (7/38) checking roughly once a week showing an increase in an individual’s Yammer activity.

**Fig. 4.23 Frequency of checking Yammer by access type**

Notably, for respondents accessing Yammer via ‘Web browser’ and using Yammer Notifier (a desktop client that uses pop-up notifications about activity on an individual’s Yammer network), an increase in activity was also observed: 14.3% (5/35) check Yammer several times a day, 54.3% (19/35) check a few times a week and 14.3% (5/35) checking roughly once a week.

The results show that mobile devices can be seen to increase an individual’s checking of Yammer, but when Yammer Notifier is utilised a similar increase is observed.

Similar results were observed in the analysis of posting to groups as seen in **Fig 4.24**.
In conclusion, mobile devices can be seen to increase an individual’s activity on Yammer. However due to the low level of respondents who selected mobile only, the research is insufficient to conclude whether the hypothesis is fully supported.

The final hypothesis examines the role that communications play in influencing the use of Yammer within the organisation.

4.3.5 Communication

**Hypothesis 10:** Structured internal communications positively influences the intention to use Yammer.

This hypothesis examines the influence effective internal communication has on an individual’s intention to use Yammer. A dedicated section of the survey was designed to focus on the organisation’s internal communications regarding Yammer. The aim was to find out how Yammer was communicated to employees. The survey questions were supplemented with information gathered during the interviews process. These interviews included questions on the level of communication believed to be required, whether there was an official launch, and enquiries on the general strategy developed to promote Yammer within the organisation.

The strategy implemented and communication channels discussed during the interview are then aligned to the findings from the survey to evaluate if structured communications and a developed implementation plan increases the likelihood of the intention to use Yammer within an organisation.

Interviewees were asked: “Do you think Yammer helps with internal communications across the organisation?”

There was agreement across all four organisations that Yammer has the potential to facilitate and improve communications within the organisation. The interviewee from Organisation B however,
was the only one who stated there was a policy regarding uploading content to Yammer. This included a strategy to keep content up to date and notify employees of any internal changes.

There was also training for senior management regarding taking ownership of groups and encouraging information to be shared within Yammer. Senior management were targeted as they were seen as having the greatest potential in terms of influence over employees and encouraging adoption and use. These findings support those from Hypotheses 6 and 7 which concluded that active contribution by management can positively influence user engagement on Yammer which was clearly shown in the results from Organisation B.

However, the interviewee from Organisation B was the only interviewee who not only agreed with the statement but said internal communications were working effectively on Yammer. Speaking about launching an enterprise social network across a company the interviewee said: “It’s very important to be quite clear about how this is going to help us to work more effectively together.”

As mentioned above, although the other three organisations agreed that Yammer can help with internal communications, all noted that it was not being utilised for this purpose in each of the organisations. A potential reason for this could be the lack of a clear strategy or identification of a central purpose for Yammer before its launch, something that was identified by the interviewee from Organisation B as an essential element.

In response to the question, “How do you think the organisation could increase the usage of Yammer activity?” the interviewee in Organisation A outlined how an increase in the amount of internal content posted could help drive up the levels of employees using Yammer. It was suggested that HR notifications regarding promotions or new policies etc., instead of being emailed to staff, could be posted to Yammer as well as other staff notifications within the organisation.

For this to happen, it was suggested a strategy would need to be agreed with senior management before such a decision could be undertaken. There was a clear emphasis placed on the importance of publishing internal news and information regarding the organisation on Yammer and how it could act as a means of increasing the levels of usage.

The response from the interviewee from Organisation D was similar to the answer given from Organisation A. It was discussed how Yammer has the potential to facilitate communications across the organisation but that was dependent on widespread adoption and buy-in by the whole organisation for it to be successful.

The interviewee from Organisation C was also positive regarding this statement during the interview but outlined how an existing bulletin board system which caters for internal communications was already in existence and therefore there was no impetus for staff to post on Yammer. This was considered a possible cause for the low levels of adoption and use of Yammer in relation to internal communications in that organisation and that Yammer was now only being used by a minority of employees.

To research the importance of Yammer as a medium for conveying internal news, survey respondents were provided with the statement “I would use Yammer more if”, and given an option to choose the following: “Up-to-date and relevant company news was published”. There was a high level of agreement across all four organisations with 84.3% (140/168) of respondents answering
positively to this statement reflecting the importance individuals place on being able to access content and information relating to company news.

Respondents were asked to respond with the level of agreement to the statement: “I regularly find useful content and work-related information on Yammer”. Respondents who answered positively to this statement accounted for 50% (84/168) of the total with a further 32.1% (54/168) undecided or neutral, and 17.7% (30/168) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

When the responses are then examined by organisation, there is an increase from the overall figure to 73.8% (31/42) for Organisation B compared to 56.5% (48/85) for Organisation A, 20.8% (5/24) for Organisation C and 0% (0/17) for Organisation D. It is worth noting that this statement relates to regular content being uploaded to Yammer and Organisation D is not actively using the tool at present, explaining why there are no responses. Fig 4.25 below highlights the responses to this statement by organisation.

![Graph showing distribution of responses by organisation](image)

**Fig. 4.25 Organisation comparison regarding access to useful content on Yammer**

Although all organisations answered positively to the statement that they would use Yammer more if “Up-to-date and relevant company news was published” at 84.3% (140/168), respondents in Organisation B responded higher in terms of finding the information they are looking for. This could be linked back to the communication strategy implemented to encourage the use of Yammer within the organisation.

As part of the organisations communications strategy and their approach to it, interviewees were also asked: “What ongoing communications regarding Yammer, if any, are taking place?”

The interviewees for Organisation A, C and D all stated there was currently no regular communications posted through Yammer. It was however suggested within Organisations A and D
that the reason was due to the fact that there were no guidelines in existence on what type of content should be focused on, and there was no strategy regarding regular communications.

Organisation A is presently working on a re-launch of Yammer aimed for later in 2015. They are currently seeking advice from other organisations and working with Microsoft about how best to implement a Yammer based strategy for driving internal communications.

The interviewee from Organisation B outlined how an internal communications strategy has already been implemented within their organisation and how it forms a key part of their Yammer strategy. The purpose of their ongoing communications was aimed at sharing examples of how people can use Yammer more effectively together. This included promoting Yammer and explaining how it works on a consistent basis. There is also a Yammer support group that provides ongoing communications. One of the examples given involved a promotional campaign to celebrate Yammer’s first year in the company, discussing the progress which has been made and promoting the benefits which it offers to employees.

The next chapter provides a summary of the conclusions drawn from the data analysis and forms the basis for recommendations regarding the implementation of Yammer within an organisation.
CHAPTER 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This research identifies four main areas for consideration for organisations considering implementing an ESN such as Yammer.

Training:

Individuals have experience of these technologies and are familiar with social networking platforms therefore they do not necessarily require training to learn how to use them. The exploration of Facebook use in our research suggests that individuals are highly engaged with this social networking technology and that this makes Yammer easier to use for them. What could be required, however, is training on how a platform, such as Yammer, can add value to them in a professional capacity. With this in mind it is recommended that any organisation considering implementing an enterprise social network should have a clear strategy for how they wish the ESN to support business processes in order to clearly communicate this to staff.

A key statement supporting this came from the interviewee from Organisation B who said: “It is important to make sure you have identified what the value is in collaborating and making sure you know there is a clear purpose that encourages people to use it.”

Management buy-in and engagement:

One of the benefits of an enterprise social network is the fact that it facilitates access to senior leadership and opens up communication across hierarchies. Management use and encouragement of Yammer was found to be a driver for employee adoption of the platform. Out of the four organisations studied, only one was found to have active engagement by management and this activity was reflected in the level of success of Yammer within that organisation. There appeared to be a lack of management buy-in across the other three organisations which was a contributing factor as to why Yammer had low levels of adoption. One interviewee noted that the idea of incorporating social tools was not fully understood by all in management positions with some believing it could negatively impact on productivity. Therefore, in order to successfully implement an ESN across an organisation it is imperative to educate managers as to how Yammer can add value to the organisation which will encourage management buy-in to act as leaders and champions of the initiative.

Communications:

It was concluded that no structured communications took place in relation to Yammer across three of the four organisations. This resulted in a lack of awareness of the platforms existence, negatively impacting on adoption levels. It was also found that no ongoing communications were taking place. Therefore, when considering implementing an ESN it is essential for those championing it to understand how the platform can service a need that employees and the business may have and to clearly communicate that fact. Identifying these needs, and communicating them in a structured and regular way to staff will encourage engagement with the ESN. It is also recommended that before launching an ESN such as Yammer, a communications strategy should be defined and champions identified so that regular updates are circulated to employees in relation to the technology. This will help to ensure engagement is sustained with the platform while it is becomes part of the working culture in the organisation.
**Critical mass:**

It was concluded that for an ESN to gain widespread levels of adoption a critical mass of users is required. The findings revealed that survey respondents who perceived the ESN as being widely used were more inclined to engage on the platform. Therefore in order to realise the true value of Yammer or a similar ESN, a critical mass of users is necessary. One recommendation that could assist in building a critical mass of users would be to identify business units and teams where Yammer could add value and begin the roll out of the platform within those groups. Employing a strategic approach such as this could mean the difference between engaged, enthusiastic users and rejection of the technology. Implementing the recommendations outlined above will also assist in growing an engaged community of users.

In conclusion, our research shows that implementing an Enterprise Social Network has many challenges. From the analysis conducted a number of recommendations have been made that could assist organisations in addressing these. Further research into how organisations can successfully employ an ESN to positively impact employee engagement and drive business value needs to be conducted. It is clear from this study that enterprise social networks have the ability to empower organisations through the socialising of business.
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Appendices

Appendix A

BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH:

This research is aimed at looking at the adoption of enterprise social networking within a set of organisations, how it is used, managed and the levels of participation by staff.

We are investigating to what extent user adoption is the result of: an individual’s perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use; senior management buy-in; line manager’s promotion and adoption of the platform; the resources and facilitating conditions made available by the IT department and how it is disseminated to staff.

MISSION STATEMENT

We will ensure voluntary participation for those taking part in both the interview and survey with an opt-out clause on any question which they may be asked to provide an answer for. We will limit objectionable or intrusive content while maintaining the confidentiality of each participant.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

We acknowledge that we are taking advantage of existing working relationships in order to make progress as part of our research.

Information gathered as part of this survey will not be used or shared for projects within the organisation.

SURVEY INFORMATION

As part of this research we have compiled a survey to help gather information which will guide us as part of this study. The questions have been designed to cover each of the areas described above so that we can formulate results and draw conclusions from the information which has been gathered. The criteria for participants is that they are working within one of the organisations taking part in the study and that they have used Yammer within that organisation.

The survey is created online using Survey Monkey which will take an estimated 10 minutes to complete. Each question is optional so please feel free to omit a response to any question; however the researcher would be grateful if all questions are responded to. The survey contains no open ended questions, all of which have a set of choices and require no text input. Participants will have limited involvement once the survey is complete. On rare occasion there might be a request for a follow up on the information which was gathered but the involvement required from each participant again will be limited.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks attached to participating in this research project. The findings will be made available to any participants at the conclusion of the research once it has been published. We
hope the conclusions which we reach could be beneficial to those who took part in giving a better insight into our area of research and its relevance to those who took part in the study.

DEBRIEFING

All participants will be informed as to the timelines for research and research publication. Research findings will be made available to those participants who are interested. All responses will be anonymous and findings will ensure not to identify respondents or the organisation in which they are employed.

LEAD RESEARCHERS

Emma Moffatt, Thomas Kiely, Olivia Waters & Gavin Duffy

PROCEDURES OF THIS STUDY

The project start date is 9th February 2015 and it will conclude on 26th March 2015. The criteria for selecting participants are based around the fact that they work within one of the organisations included in the study and that they are a registered Yammer user. Information gathered will be kept confidential and there are no risks attached to any participants who take part in this study. The information is intended for the purpose of the research and will not be used for any other means other than for research purposes within this project.

PUBLICATION

Presented during Hilary Term Weeks 10-11(17th – 26th March), venue TBC. Individual results may be aggregated anonymously and research reported on aggregate results.

DECLARATION

- I am 18 years or older and am competent to provide consent.
- 

I have read, or had read to me, a document providing information about this research and this consent form. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and all my questions have been answered to my satisfaction and understand the description of the research that is being provided to me.

- I agree that my data is used for scientific purposes and I have no objection that my data is published in scientific publications in a way that does not reveal my identity.
- I understand that if I make illicit activities known, these will be reported to appropriate authorities.
- I understand that I may stop electronic recordings at any time, and that I may at any time, even subsequent to my participation have such recordings destroyed (except in situations such as above).
- I understand that, subject to the constraints above, no recordings will be replayed in any public forum or made available to any audience other than the current researchers/research team.
I freely and voluntarily agree to be part of this research study, though without prejudice to my legal and ethical rights.

I understand that I may refuse to answer any question and that I may withdraw at any time without penalty.

I understand that my participation is fully anonymous and that no personal details about me will be recorded.

I understand that if I or anyone in my family has a history of epilepsy then I am proceeding at my own risk.

I have received a copy of this agreement.

* 1. Having read the terms outlined above, please indicate whether or not you would like to proceed with this survey.
   - I agree (continue to survey) I disagree (exit survey)

Each question is optional. Feel free to omit a response to any question; however we would be grateful if all questions are responded to.

   2. Age
      - 18 - 29
      - 30 - 44
      - 45 - 60
      - >60

   3. Gender
      - Female
      - Male

   4. Years with organisation
      - 1-5
      - 6-10
      - 11-15
      - 16-20
      - 21+
5. Are you a line manager?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Which of the following best describes your job function:
   - Communications
   - Administration
   - Finance
   - HR
   - IT/IS
   - Marketing/ Digital Media
   - Operations
   - Sales
   - Procurement
   - Other

7. How would you rate your computing skills?
   - Basic
   - Intermediate Advanced

8. I am generally open to trying out new technologies, in particular social media/networking:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided/ Neutral
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

9. Which of the following social networking sites do you currently have an account with?
10. Do you use Facebook?
- Yes
- No

11. Why did you initially sign up to Facebook?
- To network and/or make new connections
- To stay in touch with friends and family
- I can’t remember

12. How do you access Facebook?
- Web browser (Desktop/Laptop)
- Mobile device (Smartphone/Tablet)
- Both

13. I access Facebook using a:
- Work device
- Personal device
- Both

14. How often do you check Facebook?
15. How often do you post status updates on Facebook?

- Several times a day
- A few times a week
- Roughly once a week
- Less frequently
- Never

16. What do you access Facebook for?

- Personal use
- Work related
- Both

17. I use Facebook to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided/ Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find out what friends are doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask people for advice/questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let others know what I am doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find people who share similar interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find out about latest news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How easy to do you find Facebook to use in terms of:
19. It is easier to use Yammer because I am familiar with Facebook:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Undecided/ Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

20. Do you use Yammer?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

21. Is your team/department/function currently active on Yammer?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don't know

22. In my opinion, a significant number of employees within my organisation actively use Yammer:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Undecided/ Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

23. Why did you initially sign up to Yammer?
To network and/or make new connections
To stay in touch with colleagues
Other colleagues were using it
An account was automatically created for me by my organisation
I don't know

24. How would you access Yammer?
- Web browser (Desktop/Laptop)
- Mobile device (Smartphone/Tablet)
- Both

25. I would access Yammer on:
- Work device
- Personal device
- Both

26. How often would you check Yammer?
- Several times a day
- A few times a week
- Roughly once a week
- Less frequently
- When prompted by alerts/colleagues

27. How often would you post to groups on Yammer?
- Several times a day
- A few times a week
- Roughly once a week
- Less frequently
- Never

28. I would use Yammer Notifier:
29. I would use Yammer to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided/Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find out what others are working on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let colleagues know what I am doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about internal news/operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge about industry trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. How easy would you find Yammer to use in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalising your newsfeed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing membership of groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Yammer is a useful tool:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. Yammer helps me find answers to questions faster:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

33. Yammer helps my team communicate and collaborate more efficiently:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

34. Yammer helps people in my organisation to communicate and collaborate better:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided/Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

35. I would use Yammer more if:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided/Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues were using it more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managers were encouraging use

Senior management were visibly using it

Up-to-date and relevant company news was published

It provided insights into industry trends

36. Yammer facilitates better communication with co-workers:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided/ Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

37. I regularly find useful content and work-related information on Yammer:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Undecided/ Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

38. Does your manager use Yammer?

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know

39. If yes, how often does your manager post updates?

- Several times a day
- A few times a week
- Roughly once a week
- Less frequently
40. Does your manager encourage use of Yammer?
- Yes
- No

41. The use of Yammer is encouraged by management within my organisation for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided/Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding out what colleagues are working on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letting colleagues know what I am doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following colleagues with similar interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning more about internal news/operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning more about industry trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Managers in my organisation use Yammer to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided/Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create groups (local news, projects etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Praise' colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share relevant content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate inter-team and cross-functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Was there an official Yammer launch in your organisation?
- Yes
- No
- I don't know

44. If Yes, how was the launch communicated?
45. If No, how did you find out about Yammer?

☐ Organisation-wide communications
☐ Line manager
☐ Co-worker(s)
☐ IT

Other

46. Are you aware of Yammer champions (or Yambassadors) within your organisation?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don’t know

47. Does your organisation provide Yammer training?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don’t know

48. Do you feel training is required to use Yammer?

☐ Yes
☐ No

49. Does your organisation provide guidelines on Yammer use and etiquette?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ I don’t know

50. Yammer is used to its full potential in my organisation:
51. I believe Yammer will continue to be used as a collaborative tool within my organisation:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Undecided/Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

52. I enjoy using Yammer:

- [ ] Strongly Agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Undecided/Neutral
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
Appendix B
Interview questions themes and questions:

Appetite for change

- How open do you think your organisation is to change in terms of new technologies?
- Would using Yammer be a big step for your organisation in terms of changing the way of working?
- What other collaboration tools does the organisation use?

Collaboration

- Do you think people collaborate well in your organisation?
  - Is collaboration mainly between peers or is there a high level of collaboration across the organisation’s hierarchies?
- Do you think collaboration is facilitated by technology?
  - If so, what tools do you think facilitate communications across the organisation?
- Do you think Yammer helps with internal communications?
- One of the positive benefits of Yammer is that it claims to cut across traditional enterprise hierarchies?
  - Do you think this is true in your organisation?
- Are you aware of any particular examples of where Yammer has been able to add value to staff?

Purpose/Goal

- What was the purpose/goals for choosing to implement Yammer?
- Was the decision to implement it driven by IT or another area of the business?
- What level of management support/sponsorship was there?

Launch

- How was Yammer launched / formally communicated in your organisation?
  - Was there a pilot before it was fully rolled out?
- What level of management buy-in do you think there was prior to the launch?
  - Do you think that management / leadership buy-in was visible?
- Was any training given and/or training material provided?
- Were Yammer champions (Yambassadors) appointed?

Usefulness

- What are the key benefits that Yammer delivers for the organisation?
- Are you aware of any feedback from users on the tools usefulness?
  - If so, how has it been captured and used?
Ongoing Communications

- What ongoing communications regarding Yammer, if any, are taking place?
  - What is the purpose of these communications? {Information, training, promoting use etc.}
  - Are new staff members automatically added to the Yammer network? If so, how are they informed about it?
- Do you think additional communication is required to inform staff about the tool?
  - What would you like to see happening in this space?

Success/Future

- Has Yammer been a success in your organisation? How and why?
  - Were any success factors identified before it was launched?
- How do you think the organisation could increase the usage of Yammer activity?
- Do you think management is promoting it sufficiently?
- What does the next 12 months hold for Yammer in your company?
Appendix C

Yammer Notifier

Results from the survey showed that 31% (40/129) of Desktop/Laptop users check Yammer when prompted by alerts/colleagues. 27.6% (35/127) of Desktop/Laptop users have Yammer Notifier installed, 41.7% (53/127) do not use Yammer Notifier, and 30.7% (39/127) did not know.

While there are a lower percentage of respondents using Yammer Notifier, of the respondents that are, a significant increase in Yammer activity (checking and posting to groups) can be observed in the following chart:

For respondents using Yammer Notifier, 14.29% (5/35), 54.29% (19/35) and 14.29% (5/35) check the platform several times a day, a few times a week and roughly once a week, respectively. For those respondent who replied with “No/ I don’t know” a significant decrease in checking was observed (3.26% (3/92) several times a day, 18.48% (17/92) a few times a week, and 17.39% (16/92) roughly once a week).
For respondents using Yammer Notifier, 14.29% (5/35) reported that they post to groups a few times a week with 11.43% (4/35) posting to groups roughly once a week. For those respondents who replied with “No/ I don’t know” a notable decline in posting to groups was observed 1.09% (1/92) several times a day, 2.17% (2/92) a few times a week, and 2.17% (2/92) roughly once a week). Therefore it can be concluded that respondents using Yammer Notifier are inclined to check for updates and post to groups on Yammer more frequently, and although with a minimal variance, not as regularly as individuals ‘Web browser’ and mobile devices.

With the majority of respondents accessing Yammer via “Web browser” and a combined 72.4% (92/127) not using or knowing about Yammer Notifier, it can be reasoned that the installation of this resource application/add-on would increase an individual’s activity.

Analysis of the data gathered as part of the survey and interview responses from each organisation suggests a structured communications strategy can increase an individual’s intention to use Yammer. Identifying clear goals as to why the organisation is looking to implement Yammer from the outset and defining its purpose seems to be one of the main aspects which can lead to successful adoption as demonstrated by Organisation B.