A Life Cycle Perspective on Online Community Success[1]

ALICIA IRIBERRI AND GONDY LEROY
School of Information Systems and Technology
Claremont Graduate University, California

_____

Using the information systems life cycle as a unifying framework, we review online communities research and propose a sequence for incorporating success conditions during initiation and development to increase their chances of becoming a successful community, one in which members participate actively and develop lasting relationships. Online communities evolve following distinctive life cycle stages and recommendations for success are more or less relevant depending on the development stage of the online community. In addition, the goal of the online community under study determines the components to include in the development of a successful online community. Online community builders and researchers will benefit from this review of the conditions that help online communities succeed.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: H.5.3 [**Information Interfaces and Presentation**]: Group and Organization Interfaces – *Asynchronous interaction*; *Synchronous interaction*; *Web-based interactions*;
H5.2 [**Information Interfaces and Presentation**]: User Interfaces - *User-centered design*; H.4 [**Information Systems Applications**]: Communications Applications – *Bulletin board; e-mail*

General Terms: Design, Human Factors, Management
Additional Key Words and Phrases: Online communities, life cycle, success factors, literature review
_____

1. INTRODUCTION

The Internet is the mainstream media for information exchange and social interaction. For the past 15 years, millions of Americans have turned to it daily to conduct very diverse information seeking and communication activities. A great number of users are information consumers. They read world news, review weather forecasts, look for medical information or information on hobbies and interests, and search for maps and driving directions [Pew Internet & American Life Project 2007]. Many assumed an additional role and became information providers. They contribute content on a wide range of topics in blogs, wikis and, more recently, podcasts and videos [Baller and Green 2005; Fichter 2005; Goodnoe 2006; Totty 2007]. Today, the most popular activity for the majority of Internet users is social interaction. Of the 147 million adult Internet users in the US, 91% go online to keep in touch with friends, relatives, coworkers, and people they know in the physical world [Pew Internet & American Life Project 2007]. Included in this majority are those who take advantage of the global reach of the Internet to build new online relationships with people they have never met in person but with whom they share a common interest. Now users play games online with each other, chat and exchange information in chat rooms, discussion forums, and meeting rooms, visit social or professional networking sites, and visit dating and other social networking sites to meet people.

_____

Starting with the Well, the pioneering online community established in 1985 [Rheingold 1993], hundreds of new online communities and social networking sites have emerged [Reid and Gray 2007]. Many of those continue to exist and thrive today and show dramatic membership growth. Others draw little participation from their members and some have disappeared completely. In response, researchers from various disciplines are searching for the conditions that make online communities more or less successful. The result of this effort is in an extensive body of literature that proposes guidelines and success factors derived from different sociology, psychology, management and economy concepts and theories, a limited number of empirical studies and a variety of anecdotal stories. Kim [2000] suggests nine strategies for building successful online communities based on her practitioner experience. For example, giving the community a purpose, encouraging etiquette, and integrating rituals increase the chances of success. Preece [2000] articulates participatory design, sociability and usability concepts and recommends applying these concepts in building communities. From a social psychology perspective, Koh et al. [2007] stress the need to motivate participation, while Leimester and Krcmar [2004] conclude from their case studies that protecting the privacy of participants is essential. More recently, researchers have started empirically testing independent conditions that can indicate the success of these communities. However, little effort has been made to document the online community development processes and provide guidelines to introduce success factors and design choices in an integrated and orderly way.

Integrated and sequenced implementation guidelines will help designers decide the exact point in time in the life of the community when certain design components are most relevant as opposed to others. The impact each design component has on the success of the online community shifts depending on which life cycle stage the online community is experiencing. For example, it is important to know when it is more relevant to introduce a reward system for contributions as opposed to enforcing a strict set of behavioral rules and regulations. Making sound design choices and implementing them at the right time maximizes their impact on continued member participation and online community existence.

With the goal of collecting and ordering guidelines, we review the research and practitioner literature on online communities. We survey definitions, characteristics, and classifications of online communities. We look at the perspectives that various disciplines use to study online communities, and finally, we narrow our focus in order to understand the evolution of online communities and identify success factors in each stage of evolution. We organize the findings of our review as follows. We first explore definitions, followed by the benefits that online communities bring to individuals, communities, and organizations. Then we introduce the five life cycle stages of online communities and review the different types of online communities and how they are classified in the literature. We review different metrics used to measure success. Finally, we integrate our findings by classifying success factors according to life cycle stage and online community type. We conclude by providing recommendations for future research.

2. DEFINITIONS

Various disciplines have studied online communities, each one providing its own definition. As early as 1993, Howard Rheingold [1993], a writer and futurist and the most cited author in the online community literature,

describes online communities from a social perspective as "***social aggregations*** *that emerge from the Net when enough people carry on public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feeling to form webs of personal relationships in cyberspace.*" He stresses that it is possible to form strong and continued friendships online. Hagel and Armstrong [1997], prominent authors in the management literature, naturally focus on business models and their value to organizations. They define online communities as "*computer- mediated spaces where there is a potential for an integration of content and communication with an emphasis on **member-generated content**.*" They ascertain that the content created in online communities brings value to business organizations. In social psychology, Blanchard [2004] and Blanchard and Markus [2004] study online communities from a "sense of community" perspective and define them as "*groups of people who interact primarily through computer-mediated communication and who identify with and have developed **feelings of belonging** and attachment to each other.*" They explore the perceptions of members with respect to the community and their feelings towards other members.

Finally, in order to build consensus among researchers in the information systems field and to encourage more focused and controlled research, Lee et al. [2003] compared nine of the most popular existing definitions and produced their own. Their working definition states that online communities are "***cyberspace[s]*** *supported by computer-based **information technology***, *centered upon communication and interaction of participants to generate **member-driven content***, *resulting in a **relationship being built**.*" This definition reflects the complex nature of online communities and underlines the components of online community that should be subject to further study. These components are cyberspace, information and communication technology, member-driven content, members' interaction, and relationship formation. In this review, we adopt this working definition.

3. LITERATURE SELECTION

We searched six electronic databases: PsycInfo, Sociological Abstracts, ABI/INFORM, ACM Portal, IEEE Xplore and AIS Digital Library. We chose these databases because they cover the disciplines where the components of online communities, as defined by Lee et al. [2003], are studied. These disciplines are computer science (cyberspace), information systems (technology use), psychology (feelings and relationship formation), sociology (social interaction), and management (value of member-driven content). We found 1,167 publications that use the terms "online communities" and "virtual communities" in their abstract or title. They were published between 1993 and 2007. Table I details the coverage of the electronic databases we used. For example, IEEE Xplore and the AIS Digital Library contain the most recent conference proceedings of three major information systems conferences, specifically HICSS, ICIS and AMCIS.

In the present study, our objective is to review research findings and present an integrated method to build successful communities. Therefore, we narrowed down our search and included only those peer-reviewed papers that focus primarily on the online community design process, discuss building strategies, and test conditions that suggest online community success based on empirical findings. Once again, we searched each of the databases listed in Table I using the phrase "virtual community" or "online community" and filtered the search to include only peer-reviewed publications. We read the resulting titles and abstracts one by one and marked those papers that included the words and phrases relating to success, design or building process, and motivations for contribution and

participation. We then reviewed the list of references in each of these papers and identified additional titles that met our search criteria. Finally, we read the marked papers to extract the variables that their authors investigate and that are indicative of success. The result of this selection process was a set of 27 papers that were 1) peer reviewed, 2) empirical, and 3) test constructs indicative of success and 5 additional conceptual or practitioner-oriented publications that, although not methodologically rigorous, were frequently cited and authored by prominent writers and practitioners in online communities.

Table I. Electronic Literature Databases

Literature Search		
Database	**Discipline**	**Coverage**
PsycInfo	Psychology	More that 2,150 titles from 1800 to present
Sociological Abstracts	Sociology and related disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences	1,800 serials, publications, book chapters, dissertations and conference papers from 1952 to present
ABI/INFORM	Business Management	4,000 journals, publishers and periodicals from 1923 to present
ACM Digital Library	Computer Science and Information Systems	Publications from the Association for Computing Machinery: Journals, newsletter articles and conference proceedings published over 50 years
IEEE Xplore	Computer Science, Electrical Engineering and Electronics	Publications of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers: 132 journals, transactions, conference proceedings and magazines (1,640,248 online documents)
AIS Digital Library	Information Systems	Publications of the Association for Information Systems: Journals and conference proceedings

Table II lists authors, variables under study, and type of research of the publications we selected. The type of study column indicates whether the research is empirical, or based on data and observations, or non-empirical, or of the type which emphasizes concepts and ideas, are more descriptive in nature, and do not include a clear scholarly research question [Alavi, Carlson *et al.* 1989; Chen and Hirschheim 2004]. In this paper, we included many more papers that support specific sections on benefits or types of online communities, but that did not analyze success factors. Still many other valuable publications were excluded from our review because they do not directly test conditions that lead online communities to success, but discuss, for example, impact of online communities on society, individual member roles within online communities or research agendas. We believe that a systematic review of the 32 selected empirical research findings on online community success factors will help online community designers to achieve a more informed creation and operation of online communities that will likely lead them to success.

Table II. Research on Online Communities Design and Success by Author and Type of Study

Research on Online Community Design and Success		
Focus / Variables	**Type of Studies**	**Author**
Building Process and Strategies	Empirical	[Leimeister and Krcmar, 2003]
		[Zhang, Bot *et al.* 2001]
		[Kling and Courtright 2003]
		[Iriberri 2005]
		[Andrews *et al.* 2001]
		[Alem and Kravis 2005]
	Non-Empirical (Conceptual)	[Preece 2000]
		[Kollock 1996]
	Non-Empirical (Practitioner)	[Kim 2000]
Success Factors	Empirical	[Cothrel and Williams 1999]
		[Williams and Cothrel 2000]
		[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004]
		[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
		[Andrews *et al.* 2001]
	Non-Empirical (Conceptual)	[Preece 2000]
		[Kollock 1996]
	Non-Empirical (Practitioner)	[Kim 2000]
Subgroups Support	Empirical	[Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]
Trust Support	Empirical	[Leimeister, Ebner and Krcmar 2005]
Rewards and Recognition	Empirical	[Hars and Oe 2002]
		[Chan 2004]
		[Ludford *et al.* 2004]
		[Beenen *et al.* 2004]
	Non-Empirical (Conceptual)	[Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005]
User Motivations	Empirical	[Nonnecke and Preece 2000, 2001]
Participation and Contributions	Empirical	[Sangwan 2005]
	Non-Empirical (Conceptual)	[Jones and Rafaeli 2000]
Technology Use	Empirical	[Brazelton and Gorry 2003]
Management	Empirical	[Humel and Lehner 2002]
Member Roles	Empirical	[Butler, Sproull, Kiesler 2002, 2005]

Relationships	Empirical	[Zhang and Hiltz 2001, 2003]
Members Identity	Empirical	[Donath 1999]
Member Profiles	Empirical	[Zhang and Hiltz 2003] [Kapoor et al. 2005]
Information Sharing	Empirical	[Iriberri 2005] [Hall and Graham 2004] [Constant et al. 1994]

4. RESEARCH IN DIFFERENT DISCIPLINES

From 1993 to 2007, research on online communities grew in waves of overlapping stages through disciplines. Figure 1 illustrates these waves and Table III details the focus of each of the different disciplines and lists the concepts studied. For example, in the early 90s, computer science contributed the technological media, the standards, and the mechanisms to facilitate online communication and interaction. These technologies include the Internet and the Web as the platform on which communities develop. During subsequent years, many more applications such as e-mail, Usenets, discussion boards, chat rooms, electronic meeting rooms, web logs, wikis and, more recently, multimedia technology and applications known as Web 2.0 were added [Parameswaran and Whinston 2007]. Innovation and advances in availability and ease of use of this communication technology led to the popularization of online communities and to the initiation of the first wave of research on online communities.


Figure 1. Online community publications in different fields (based on literature searches on April 14, 2006 and September 7, 2007)

Table III. Research Focus of Different Disciplines

Research on Different Disciplines		
Discipline	**Focus**	**Artifacts/Concepts Studied**
Computer Science	Technology Media and Mechanisms	Internet, Web, e-mail, Usenets, Discussion Forums, Internet Relay Chat, Electronic Boards (wikis), Web Logs (blogs), Videos, Podcasts, and Social Network Services [Fichter 2005; Parameswaran and Whinston 2007]
Sociology	Physical vs. Virtual Community Comparisons	Social aggregations [Carver 1999; Jones and Rafaeli 2000; Cummings, Butler *et al.* 2002] Identity [Turkle 1995] Social Networks and Social Ties [Wellman, Salaff *et al.* 1996] Social Capital and Collective Action [Hampton 2003; Hampton and Wellman 1999] Impacts on Individuals and Society (e.g. isolation, social involvement and well-being) [Katz and Rice 2002; Kraut, Kiesler *et al.* 2002; Kraut, Patterson *et al.* 1996]
Management	Value of User-Generated Content	Marketing and Customer Service Organizational Knowledge [Hagel and Armstrong 1997] Organizational Knowledge [Wegner, McDermott *et al.* 2002]
Psychology	Relationship and Attachment among Community Members	Sense of Community [Blanchard 2004; Blanchard and Markus 2004]
Information Systems	Development Implementations Outcomes and Applications of Online Communities	Participatory Design and Policies of Behavior [Preece 2000] Trust and Anonymity [Lemeister and Krcmar 2003] Content Quality Rewards for Contribution [Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005] Online and Offline Interaction Support [Andrews *et al.* 2001]

During the first wave, which started in 1993 when Howard Rheingold coined the term "virtual community," sociology took the lead focusing on online communities as a social phenomenon capable of modifying how people interact in society. They compared online communities to physical communities and explored the presence of various community-related concepts such as social aggregations, identity, social networks and ties, and social and collective action. They also studied the impacts of Internet use on individuals and society, such as social isolation, social involvement, and well-being [Carver 1999; Jones and Rafaeli 2000; Cummings *et al.* 2002; Turkle 1995; Hampton 2003; Hampton and Wellman 1999; Katz and Rice 2002; Kraut *et al.* 2002; Kraut *et al.* 1996]. For example, Wellman et al. [1996] and Wellman [2005] found that online communication can strengthen face-to-face communication in local communities, as opposed to producing social isolation. Moreover, they found that online interactions can facilitate accumulation of social capital which may enhance civil involvement. Those interested in

the impact of online communities on society found that by facilitating strong social relationships, trust and reciprocity, an online community may gather enough social capital to engage in social action to achieve a collective goal [Blanchard and Horan 1998; Chaboudy and Jameson 2001; Hampton 2003; Iriberri 2005]. For example, Hampton [2003] reports on an online community where members rallied to request improved housing conditions from a developer; Kling and Courtright [2003] discuss an online community where teachers share ideas and materials to enhance math education; and Chaboudy and Jameson [2001] and Iriberri [2005] describe online communities where elementary school parents and teachers aimed to increase students' performance by increasing parent-teacher communication.

A second wave in research on online communities started around 1996 with management researchers analyzing the value to business organizations of the content generated by online communities. Hagel and Armstrong [1997] studied online communities as viable business models capable of attracting customers who are searching for information on products or activities of interest to them, who want to find and build relationships, conduct transactions, or live fantasies. They suggest that if organizations provide mechanisms to identify and satisfy customer needs more accurately this can then turn into profit for vendors. When businesses provide the space for interaction, vendors can strengthen customer loyalty and also extract customer information to further improve marketing and customer service programs. Wegner et al. [2002] focused on online communities that emerge in business organizations and that are used by employees as repositories of organizational knowledge. In these communities of practice, the knowledge created and stored by members contributes to the organization's ability to solve problems, create new products, innovate, and ultimately increase productivity [Millen, Fontaine *et al.* 2002]. This is evident in the widespread use of wikis, electronic boards, and electronic meeting rooms where team members in organizations add content and share online documents, thus reducing by one-half the time it takes them to complete projects [Conlin 2005; Goodnoe 2006].

In the third wave of online communities research, psychology researchers focused on members' relationships and attachments within online communities. Blanchard [2004] and Blanchard and Markus [2004] studied sense of community including feelings of belonging, safety, and attachment to the group. When these feelings are present, members develop lasting relationships with other members, feel attachment to the community, and perceive the online community as a source of social and emotional support. In one online community of multi-sport athletes, Blanchard and Markus [2004] found that active participants develop personal friendships that in some cases move into private and face-to-face interactions.

Lastly, in the fourth wave, information systems researchers integrated previous perspectives, developed working definitions, and created research agendas to initiate a more focused and controlled empirical study of online communities [Gupta and Kim 2004; Lee, Vogel *et al.* 2003; Li 2004]. The focus shifted to members' needs and requirements, development of electronic tools to support online communities, adoption and implementation of these tools, online communities for new purposes such as teaching and, finally, outcome assessment [Arnold, Leimeister *et al.* 2003; Kling and Courtright 2003; Stanoevska-Slabeva and Schmid 2000, 2001]. For example, Stanoevska-Slabeva and Schmid [2001] describe the activities members conduct in online communities and match those

activities with the technology platform capable of supporting those activities; and Arnold et al. [2003] present a model to translate member needs into technology requirements.

In the latter years of this fourth wave, the focus of the information systems discipline moved towards proposing conditions that would increase member participation and ensure online community success. For example, Preece [2000] recommends following a participatory design approach, which takes into consideration user needs, and establishing clear purpose combined with policies of behavior to govern the interaction of members. She refers to the fostering of "tacit assumptions, rituals, protocols, rules, and laws" that define the community identity. Similarly, Leimeister et al. [2005] propose implementing mechanisms to encourage trust, such as discretionary levels of anonymity, which can help promote lasting relationships. Most recently, empirical studies are carried out to test independent success factors such as presence of content quality, interaction support, organization of online and offline events, rewards for contributions, volunteerism, and posting of member pictures and profiles.

The four waves of online community research have produced an extensive and rich body of research that began with theoretical and conceptual effort and has started to focus on empirical and theory testing activities. In this research, extensive discussion on the definition, benefits, and classifications of online communities abound. The next sections provide an overview of these discussions that will lead to the presentation and integration of findings on the conditions that indicate online community success.

5. IMPORTANCE AND BENEFITS

A great number of online community case studies emphasize that many people are drawn to the Internet for social interaction. When people become part of an online community, they enjoy a wide variety of benefits (Table IV). A first category of benefits are inherent benefits that come from forming a social group, such as opportunities to *exchange information*, *give and receive social and emotional support*, *develop friendships*, and *have fun* [Ridings and Gefen 2004]. For example, members of a community of practice for researchers on asynchronous learning networks (i.e., online teaching) use the platform to *exchange information* and comment on the effectiveness of these networks [Zhang *et al.* 2001]. Members of online communities also *receive social and emotional support* when they need it. In the case of an online community for sufferers of a debilitating knee injury, members express their relief at being able to air their frustrations and worries during treatment and recovery periods with people who can relate to them [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]. Moreover, online communities facilitate social bonding and *friendship development* among members. Caringbridge.org and GroupLoop.org, two communities for cancer patients and their families, let teenagers who undergo chemotherapy treatments and are afraid to appear in public meet people, share their feelings, and develop lasting friendships with other teenagers undergoing similar treatments [Szabo 2006]. Finally, online communities give individual members interactive *entertainment* opportunities. Chess players, for example, enjoy playing online with others and setting up online tournaments to challenge their skills against those of other members [Ginsburg and Weisband 2004].

Table IV. Benefits of Online Communities for Individuals [Malooney-Krichmar and Preece 2005; Butler, Sproull *et al.* 2005; Johnson and Ambrose 2006; Preece 1998; 1999]

Benefits for Individuals
Information Exchange – Access to a wide variety of members, information, and experiences with whom to exchange information – Access to obscure or otherwise inaccessible information **Social Support** – Opportunity to build and maintain social ties with people already known offline or those met online – Opportunity to help and provide support to the group or to the larger community – Opportunity to offer and receive emotional support in a climate of trust, equality, and empathy – Opportunity to bond socially and generate social action **Social Interaction** – Opportunity to meet people and build friendships – Opportunity to be entertained **Time and Location Flexibility** – Flexible access to the community – Flexible time management – Spatial and temporal independence – Visibility beyond boundaries of local work or geographical community **Permanency** – The ability to think about and edit responses – The ability to store and retrieve messages – Access to research articles and hyperlinks within the community related to the focus of the community – The ability to establish permanent social presence through photographs, textual profiles, and archive messages, and the ability to control with ease one's level of participation in the community

    A second category of benefits inherent to an online community, in contrast to a physical one, originates in the media and technology. The Internet and its applications provide 24/7 access and operation, global geographical reach, asynchronous interaction, text editing capabilities, and permanent storage facilities. Members in online communities can communicate and interact with other members located in geographically distant places from the comfort of their own homes. For example, soccer enthusiasts from around the world interact in an online community and exchange pictures of their favorite players, read profiles, and stay relevant on teams' events and tournaments [Holmes 2006]. Members can interact anytime they want to (i.e., synchronously or asynchronously), and for some communities this is an essential capability. For example, in the online community of "self-harmers," members can find support anytime of the day or night [BBC News 2005]; and multiple-sclerosis patients coordinate joined injection sessions in their community to encourage each other through this painful procedure [Johnson and Ambrose 2006]. An unforeseen benefit is made possible by the editing and storage facilities, which allow members to self-paced and document their interaction with other members. For example, members of a knee injury online community express their appreciation for being able to think through and edit their messages, and incoming

members value the ability to view permanent records of members' profiles, comments, and opinions so that they can take part in ongoing discussions immediately after they join [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005].

Those members who contribute actively to the online community receive a third category of benefits. Wang and Fesenmaier [2004] found that people find self-satisfaction and pride in fulfilling their altruistic goals of helping others out within their community. Along with these individual benefits, communities have benefits as a whole. When enough members actively participate and as relationships, trust, and reciprocity builds up in the community, the community fulfills its goals and can even achieve collective goals and actions for the benefits of all, such as improving housing conditions, children's education, and water conservation. These actions would not otherwise be possible if members acted alone [Blanchard and Horan 1998; Butler *et al.* 2005; Chaboudy and Jameson 2001; Hampton 2003].

Table V. Benefits of Online Communities to Organizations [Millen *et al.* 2002]

Benefits for Organizations
Customer Loyalty
– Opportunity to obtain feedback and information on customer needs and requirements
– Opportunity to improve customer service
Employee Communication and Trust
– Better understanding of what others are doing in the organization
– Increased levels of trust
Visibility and Reputation
– Opportunity to improve reputation
– Increase access to expert knowledge
– Information exchange with highly credible sources
Productivity
– Increased quality of knowledge and advice
– Increased idea creation and enhanced problem solving
– Increased new business and product innovation
– Time saving during information seeking and sharing

Different types of benefits of online communities arise when they are hosted by profit-oriented organizations (Table V). Online communities of customers are believed to promote customer loyalty when customers perceive value in the ability to communicate with other customers regarding products and services they purchase or wish to purchase [Hagel and Armstrong 1997]. For example, buyers of fitness videos share their experiences and results at beachbody.com after using these videos. Potential buyers look for information to support their decisions to purchase those videos. Similarly, organizations with online communities of employees benefit from improved communication and trust, enhanced collaboration and access to expert knowledge, and increased productivity. In a study of nine online communities in seven organizations, Millen et al. [2002] found that employees participated in the creation, accumulation, and diffusion of knowledge within the organization through online community platforms. The organization was able to enhance problem solving, create new business and products, and increase team productivity

as the collective use of the technology facilitated interaction and reduced the time needed to seek, gather, and share information.

As more members participate actively in the online community, more of these benefits are accrued for each member and for the community. As more members contribute to the community, the community sustains itself and achieves success.

6. SUCCESS METRICS

In order for benefits to become available, an online community has to succeed. In our review, we found various ways to define and measure success. The most common metrics used in the empirical research we reviewed were volume of *members' contribution* and *quality of relationships* among members. Researchers who focus on measuring success agree that the larger the volume of messages posted and the closer members feel to each other, the more successful the online community becomes. In addition to contribution and quality of relationships, metrics that are more precise are also advocated. Preece [2001b] identified a great number of success metrics and classified them in two groups: those related to sociability and those related to usability. Sociability measures include number of participants, number of messages per unit of time, member's satisfaction, reciprocity, and trustworthiness. Usability metrics include number of errors when using the interface, user productivity, and user satisfaction among others. She emphasizes the importance of considering both categories in evaluating the success of online communities.

Although many different metrics could be used, most empirical studies used metrics that were either quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative metrics include *size* (number of members), *participation* (number of visits, hits, logins), *contributions* (number of messages posted per period), and *relationship development* (extent of contact between members). For example, Ludford, Cosley et al. [2004] measured the increase in the volume of 'contributions' in terms of the number of messages posted as a result of letting members know how unique their contributions are, which in turn results in a more lively community. Size is a common and often quoted measure of success. MySpace.com, one of the most popular social networks for young people, had 70 million active members by 2007 [News Corporation 2007] while Facebook.com has 39 million; the numbers doubled if we consider inactive members as well [Facebook 2007]. The common qualitative metrics of success are *member satisfaction* and *quality of members' relationships*. Zhang and Hiltz [2003] study the impact of making members' profiles and pictures available to the community on how satisfied members are with being part of the community. They found that geographically distant members enjoy and appreciate getting to know each other by viewing each other's pictures and reading each other's profiles. Cummings et al. [2002] found that the quality of members' relationships is lower in communities where there is limited communication and high turnover. Thus, these researchers stress the need to focus on increasing participation and maintaining a tightly knit community.

The variety of metrics shows that success is a complex concept but also that it is an important variable to measure. If researchers want to compare online communities, assess their outcomes and, more importantly, measure the impact of adding design components to an online community, they will be focusing on these success metrics.

7. ONLINE COMMUNITY TYPES

As the number of online communities continues to increase and millions participate, researchers attempt to classify communities to better study them. They generally differentiate between communities based on the need they fulfill. Hagel and Armstrong [1997] state that online communities satisfy different needs at any given time in a non-exclusive way. According to them, a community can be of **interest, relationship, fantasy,** or **transaction**. At the same time, communities are classified by **geographic** characteristics, e.g. formed by members in close proximity, by **demographic** characteristics, e.g. formed for or by people of specific age, gender, life style, or ethnicity, by **topical** characteristics such as specific interests, hobbies or pastimes, or by **activities** such as shopping, financial investment, or gaming [Kim 2000]. Lazar and Preece [1998] argue that existing online communities can also be classified based on four dimensions (Table VI): *attributes*, *supporting software*, *relation to physical communities*, and *boundedness*.

Table VI. Different Online Communities Based on Four Dimensions [Lazar and Preece 1998]

By Attributes	By Relation to Physical Communities

– Goals, interests [Kim, 2000]
  ▪ Family and Lifestyle
  ▪ Work
  ▪ Play
  ▪ Spirituality and Health
  ▪ Politics
  ▪ Business Transactions
  ▪ Education
  ▪ Intense interaction, emotional ties
– Shared activities
– Shared resources
– Support
– Conventions, language, protocols
– Size
– Anonymity levels
– Sources of revenue
	– Based on (frequent face-to-face)
	  ▪ City
	  ▪ Government
	  ▪ Education
	– Some what (periodic face-to-face)
	  ▪ Online scholarly community
	  ▪ Hobbies
	– Not related (no face-to-face)
	  ▪ Anonymity – role playing
	  ▪ Health
	  ▪ Victims of crime

By Supporting Software	**By Boundedness**
– Listservs – Newsgroup – IRC – MUD – Web-based bulletin – Team rooms	– Tightly ▪ Organization intranet – Loose

According to Lazar and Preece [1998], a**ttributes** of a community include its goals, topic of interest, type of activity, type of interaction, size, level of support, level of anonymity, type of conventions, language, and protocols, among others. As for the **relation to physical communities**, online communities may require frequent, periodic, or no face-to-face interaction. Online communities may use such **software** applications and technologies as e-mail lists, newsgroups, bulletin boards, internet-relay chat, and meeting rooms, and can be **tightly or loosely-bounded** to an organization. Lazar and Preece suggest that the label one uses to describe a community may vary as each

community shows one or more of the characteristics in each of these four dimensions. For example, krebsgemeischaft.de, a community of cancer patients, may be designated as a support or as a high interactivity community because it provides support for cancer patients and their families (**goal**) and encourages intense interaction among members (**interaction**). It also may be designated as privacy-oriented because is provides mechanisms to protect members' privacy and identity (**levels of anonymity**), or as an online community with discussion forum (**supporting software**), or as one with **periodic face-to-face** interaction because it targets patients affiliated with a specific hospital in Germany (**relation to physical community**) [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003].

Others build on the classification provided by Lazaar and Preece [1998]. Leimeister and Krcmar [2004] add source of revenue, such as subscription-based revenue, membership revenue, or usage-based revenue. Preece and Maloney-Krichmar [2003] add other supporting software possibilities such as mailing lists, UseNet news, discussion forums, chats, immersive graphic environments, and e-groups. Kim [2000] adds areas of interest such as spirituality, health, work, politics and education as goals of an online community. As the use of online communities of transactions has increased substantially, transactions have been added as a possible goal of some communities [Resnick and Zeckhauser 2002; Hiltz and Goldman 2004].

Finally, in an analysis of 50 online communities, Hummel and Lechner [2002] identified five genres of communities. These genres are **games**, **interest or knowledge**, and three other mixed genres also oriented to transactions, **business-to-business** (knowledge and transactions), **business-to-consumer** (interest, commerce, and transactions) and **consumers-to-consumers** (interest, trade, and transaction). These genres are based on four dimensions that characterize a community, namely, a defined group of actors, interaction, sense of place, and bonding. Each of these dimensions exists in each community in the form of features and management activities. For example, a community has a clearly defined group of actors if it has a precise content focus and clear entry and access rules. Hummel and Lechner's work is relevant to our review because they provide the basis to translate the four dimensions of online communities into physical features (i.e., management and technology) that can be implemented in an online community. We use Hummel and Lechner's [2002] work to prescribe the implementation and highlight the importance of specific success factors in each of the different community genres.

For a period between 2005 and 2007, there was an explosion of a new type of online communities, known as social networking sites. These social networking sites are online communities whose only purpose is the creation and maintenance of social relationships or friendships. Because of the growth in this new type of online communities, compared to the limited growth of traditional communities of interest, it seemed that this community type would become the most prevalent. Members of these social networking sites use multimedia and Web 2.0 technologies such as social bookmarking and photo and video sharing to build their profiles and introduce themselves to other members [Parameswaran and Whinston 2007]. Members create detailed electronic profiles and invite other members to become their electronic acquaintances (or, more recently, help others create their profiles, like in YahooGraffiti.com). The emphasis on these social networking sites is on meeting people and including them in networks of friends. The most notable examples of social networking sites are MySpace.com and Facebook.com. Promoters of these communities believed they had found the key to motivate member participation that would lead to successful communities. However, privacy and safety concerns of members along with limited return of

investments decelerated the growth of these communities. This deceleration is making developers of social networking sites refocus their efforts on promoting vertical social networks for members with similar personal interests. These vertical social networks would behave in the same way as traditional online communities of interest do when, for example, pet lovers, football fans, and video creators interact, exchange information, and relate to each other except they would do it within the social networking services where they are already members [Bajarin 2007; Ezzy 2006]. Hence, in essence social networking sites are online communities that take advantage of the new and improved social computing technology for interaction and multimedia information exchange. Parameswaran and Whinston [2007] in a comprehensive overview of social computing conclude that Web 2.0, online communities and social computing are different terms to refer to those applications and services that "facilitate collective action and social interaction with rich exchange of multimedia information".

8. LIFE CYCLE MODEL

Online communities evolve in stages, and each stage presents distinct characteristics and needs. Community building efforts must take into consideration the needs of members and of the whole community in each stage [Preece 2000; Andrews 2002; Kling and Courtright 2003; Malhotra, Gosain *et al.* 1997]. Wegner et al. [2002] identified five stages in building online communities: potential, coalescing, maturing, stewardship and transformation. Andrews [2002] suggests three stages: starting the online community, encouraging early online interaction, and moving to a self-sustained interactive environment. Malhotra et al. [1997] illustrate four stages of evolution and design using an online community of college football fans. They describe the inception, beginning of user involvement, interactivity, and growth and experimentation activities of this community over a two-year period. These authors maintain that to motivate contribution in online communities, features must evolve according to members' needs in each stage.

In this review, we labeled the five stages of the online community life cycle as follows: inception, creation, growth, maturity, and death (Figure 2). We chose these names because they match the stages in the information systems life cycle (ISLC), a widely known concept used by information systems developers. The ISLC is a comprehensive model that describes the development and operation of any information system. The main idea is that any system "must evolve through the same consistent and logical process without ignoring any step" [Ahituv and Neumann 1982]. Ahituv and Neumann emphasize the need to use a user-/management-oriented approach for developing information systems, in which developers identify what the system should do (what are the needs) as opposed to how it does it (what technology). They also emphasize that the nature of the life cycle is not linear, but that in practice it is an iterative process. In an online community, the needs of users and management evolve along with the life cycle stages of the community. Therefore, developers need to understand the online community life cycle and identify what users and management will need in each stage to develop the community and encourage participation.

The first stage in the online community life cycle is inception. At *inception*, the idea for an online community emerges because of people's (members and operators) needs for information, support, recreation, or relationship. Depending on the type of need, interested individuals, or a group of friends, begin forming a vision for a community

where people can disseminate information, communicate and interact [Malhotra *et al*. 1999; Wegner *et al*. 2002]. Examples include communities of support for diabetes patients, communities to discuss water conservation alternatives, and communities to bring video game players together to discuss and improve their game strategies. In addition to the vision, incipient communities begin with a focus and some rules of behavior and communication, which helps the community maintain focus.

Once the vision is clear, the required technological components, including Internet applications such as e-mail, listserv, bulletin board, discussion forums, or chats, may be selected and gradually incorporated, responding to the needs and preferences of creators and initial and potential members. The *creation* of the online community begins when these technological components are in place and when the initial group of members can begin to interact and spread the word for other members to join [Malhotra *et al.* 1997].


Figure 2. Online communities' life cycle

In time and when enough members have joined, a culture and identity for the community begins to develop. Members start using a common vocabulary and, as the community grows, members select the roles they will play in the community. Additionally, communication and participation etiquette rules surface. Some members lead

discussions, some provide support, while many look for that support and information. Some members become leaders while others become followers or lurkers, who read messages posted by other members but do not actively contribute to the community. Some volunteer information while others use this information [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece; Butler *et al.* 2005; Nonnecke and Preece 2000; Nonnecke and Preece 2001; Ridings, Gefen *et al.* 2006]. These characteristics, common to both online and physical communities, initiate the *growth* stage of the online community.

As the online community *matures* the need for a more explicit and formal organization with regulations, rewards for contributions, subgroups, and discussion of more or less specific topics is evident. In this stage, the community is strengthened and trust and lasting relationships begin to emerge. Throughout the life of the community, new members join in and old members whose needs are satisfied or whose initial excitement for joining the community wears down leave the community. As new members join, the community evolves and a cycle of interaction repeats. New members bring new ideas for discussion and their roles change [Nonnecke and Preece 2001; Burkett 2006; Ridings *et al.* 2006]. Many communities thrive in this stage for long periods. Other communities change course, or add new features to maintain user interest, iterating in a mature state. Still others lose momentum and member interest and begin to *die* when they face poor participation, lack of quality content, unorganized contribution, and transient membership [Jarvenpaa and Knoll 1998].

Activities and needs of members change in each stage of the online community evolution. They require different tools, features, mechanisms, technologies and management activities. Developers have to identify the needs in each stage and add the right technology components that will better support the community, in the way the information systems life cycle prescribes.

We believe that matching features with each community life cycle stage may more efficiently lead to success. In our review we found that existing research focuses on independent (i.e., isolated) factors or features that may lead to community success. Existing research results are valuable in understanding the online community phenomenon and identifying success factors, but little effort has been made to identify when in the life of the community each component or success factor must be implemented or to what degree to maximize the impact on success. We ascertain that the technology and mechanisms that support and ensure success of online communities should evolve to match their growth and evolution. If each stage of the online community life cycle presents different requirements and challenges, then stressing specific success factors at a certain stage of evolution will be more important. Relevant technology support at the appropriate stages is necessary, if success factors implemented in previous stages are maintained.

We also believe that the purpose or type of online community determines the degree of relevance each specific factor may have in the success of the community. In the next two sections, we review existing views of success and propose a sequence to add features to online communities to ensure success.

9. ISOLATED SUCCESS FACTORS BASED ON CURRENT RESEARCH

Recommendations for building online communities from various disciplines range from lists of strategies to design principles and theoretical frameworks [Preece 2001ab; Kling and Courtright 2003; Andrews 2002]. Figure 3

illustrates the current views on online communities by researchers of different disciplines. It also demonstrates how each discipline has its own focus of study. Sociologists suggest modeling online communities after physical communities to ensure success. In their recommendations, they use theories that explain identity, social interaction, and social organizations. Kollock's [1996] design principles for online communities and Wasko's and Teigland's [2004] research agenda use theories on social dilemmas, cooperation, public commons, and collective action. The most salient design principles resulting from their work are the incorporation of identity persistence (i.e., ability to recognize members by names), group boundaries (i.e., ability to differentiate rightful members), and permeated control (i.e., ability to allow group members to monitor and sanction members' behaviors).

Business practitioners and management researchers provide development strategies and focus on the value of online communities to organizations. Kim [2000] contributes a set of nine strategies and three design principles. Similarly, Cothrel and William [1999] contributed seven principles for success based on an extensive study of fifteen successful business online communities. These authors agree on the importance of three conditions: focusing on the needs of users and explicitly indicating that satisfying these needs is the purpose of the online community, providing support for individual roles of members, such as moderators or experts, within the community, and facilitating the organizations of online and offline activities or events. Furthermore, management researchers focus on creating successful business models to attract customers and enhance customer loyalty.

Figure 3. Current research: Online community success factors as seen by different disciplines

Psychology, human computer interaction, and computer-supported collaborative work researchers study people's motivations to participate in and contribute to online communities. Blanchard and Markus [2004] apply theories of sense of community and emphasize the importance of having facilitators to encourage discussions and reward

members for their contributions, and ensuring member's legitimacy and persistent identity. Similarly, Beenen et al. [2004] highlight the need to encourage contributions by explicitly acknowledging members' uniqueness of opinions.

Information systems researchers reference these theories and propose frameworks for developing successful online communities. Preece's [2000] and Tedjmulia et al.'s [2005] frameworks stress the importance of incorporating sociability-support and usable components in the design of online communities. Sociability-support components include the existence of clear purpose, protocols, and codes of behavior. Usability components include the ease of use with which users can find information or the speed with which users can navigate through the online community. Incorporating these conditions in the design ensures the path to success. Tedjamulia et al. [2005] go further and encourage the incorporation of extrinsic reinforcements such as gifts, social recognition, and feedback to motivate online community members to contribute actively to the community.

Leimeister and Sidiras [2004] compiled a list of 30 different success factors drawn from existing research in information systems and other fields and ranked them according to importance from the perspective of participants and operators. They found that participants and operators value in first and second place the ability of the online community to handle member data sensitively and the stability of the online community website. Leimeister, Ebner et al. [2005] empirically tested the impact on success of factors such as exposing the identity of managers and content providers, clearly establishing their goals for the online community, making up-to-date and expert-generated content available, making members' profiles available for other members, and providing varying levels of anonymity. They found that these components build trust among members and motivate continued membership. Others are testing many other components such as rewards for contributions, assignment of administrative roles to members, acknowledgment of members' longevity, organization of online and offline public events, posting of member's pictures and profiles, among others. The one factor researchers focused on most is member recognition and rewards for contributions [Ginsburg and Weisband 2004; Andrews 2001; Andrews, Preece *et al.* 2001; Beenen *et al.* 2004; Butler *et al.* 2005; Chan 2004; Hall and Graham 2004; Hars and Ou 2002; Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005]. Providing reward for contributions seems to increase the number of messages posted by community members, making it more active and more successful.

The current volume of online community research is vast but findings related to success are isolated. Online community designers face a myriad of design strategies and features with little guidance on how to integrate these when building online community platforms. A one-time effort to integrate all these components is costly and not necessarily productive in terms of maximizing success. It is necessary to integrate all the disconnected findings into a set of guidelines based on the growth of the community and its needs. What follows is a description of current research on success factors, with an indication as to when they matter most to community development according to the life cycle of the community.

10. INTEGRATED SUCCESS FACTORS BY COMMUNITY LIFE CYCLE STAGE

We integrated the success factors found by researchers and practitioners into the information systems life cycle model for different types and genres of online communities. We based this integration on research articles that reported findings on the conditions that lead to participation, contribution, sustainability, and success of online

communities. The criteria to select articles in this review are explained in Section 3. In our integrated life cycle model depicted in Figure 4, we match the online community building process with timed stages. We also indicate the features that should be selected and gradually added depending on the type of community under development (i.e., what is necessary in each stage) and the purpose of the community (i.e., for what type of community the feature is essential). The rationale used to classify factors by stage was the result of our and others' experience building online communities, like Arnold and Leimeister [2003], Preece [2000], Kim [2000], and Cothrel and Williams [1999].


Figure 4. Integrated view: Online community success as seen from a life cycle perspective

This classification of factors is also based on reports by the various authors who have described the online community life cycle, specifically Malhotra *et al.* [1999], Wegner *et al.* [2002] and Andrews [2002] (see Section 8); tested online community success factors, such as Leimeister *et al.* [2005], Beenen *et al.* [2004], Zhang and Hiltz [2003], and Maloney-Krichmar and Preece [2005] (see Table II); and identified online community types and genre, such as Hummel and Lechner [2005] (see Section 5). The review of research findings help us decide, for example, that at maturity, when a critical mass of members is reached (as opposed to at inception, when the community has very few members), it is necessary to include subgroup support to manage information overload [Jones and Rafaeli 2000; Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]; and that at inception a sense of purpose and a trademark for the community must exist [Preece 2000; Kim 2000].

Our life cycle perspective incorporates the interaction between a changing hardware and software platform, and the development of the community as a response to its social dynamics and evolution prescribed by the authors we reviewed. Online community hardware and software development must evolve along with the online community through a life cycle. Table VII through Table XI detail the integration of success factors per life cycle stage. In each table, the first column lists **success factors**, the second lists the **type of community** or genre where the factors were tested and studied, and the third column lists the **authors** who reported those conditions as success factors. We present one table per life cycle stage with the success conditions or features that should be implemented in that stage according to the reviewed literature.

We grouped reported conditions and labeled them in bold with a generic name for easy reference. For example, Table VII (inception) lists **purpose** as a success factor, lists online **communities of support and interest** as the type of community where this purpose was studied, and shows Andrews *et al.* 2001; Kim 2000; Leimeister *et al.* 2005; Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005 as the **authors** who reported on the impact of this success factor. This table shows that having a clear purpose and a specific population target is paramount in the inception stage, as opposed to, for example, rewarding members or managing subgroups, which is necessary in the maturity stage. If at inception an online community does not have a clear purpose, then participants will not feel attracted to participate or their contribution will be off-target. Similarly, Table VIII (creation) shows that Hummel and Lechner [2002] found **privacy protection** is an important condition to **game communities**. However, they found that **communities of interest and support** are interested in knowing the **identity** (i.e., member profile) of each member, since knowing the history of each member increases their credibility and their contribution's perceived-value to the community. They found that **communities of knowledge** also prefer to be able to read each member's profile.

In analyzing Table VII through Table XI it is important to emphasize that although some factors are more important than others depending on the **life stage** or **type** of online communities, none should be neglected. Once implemented, each of them must remain in place in the community throughout their life cycle. That is, once each factor is present, it should continue to exist in the subsequent stages of the online community evolution. For example, if codes of behavior are established in the inception stage they should continue to exist in the growth and maturity stages for them to have a positive effect on the success of the community. In the following sections, the success factors for the inception stage are explained in detail in both the text and table. In lieu of being too repetitive, factors in other stages are generally reviewed in the text and listed in detail in the corresponding tables.

10.1 Inception

During inception, the idea for an online community emerges to satisfy a need for information, support, recreation, or relationship. Some communities emerge when a small group of people with a similar interest interacts online, while others are born when a business organization provides a platform for interaction. Success factors such as purpose, focus, a code of conduct, trademark, and source of revenue in this stage are necessary for all types of communities. Table VII lists the success factors in this stage.

Purpose: Before the online community support hardware and software platform is put together, creators must have a clear purpose for the community, and this purpose needs to be explicitly written in the online community

interface (i.e., homepage). Potential members need to know what the online community's purpose is before they can decide to participate.

Focus: Creators must decide on the need they will address and identify characteristics of the target audience (i.e., interests, age, gender, and ethnicity). They need to ensure that they cater to those needs. In this stage, Wegner *et al*. [2002] recommend also specifying clearly the community's area of interest to its members.

Codes of Conduct: Operators need to establish regulations clearly to be able to contain possible conflicts and allow for effective monitoring of member's behavior such as the language used, age of members, and whether or not they are allowed to advertise products or services. In the case of online communities that are born in business organizations' platforms, stricter codes of conducts or regulations may exist.

Table VII. Online Community Success Factors for the Inception Stage

Life Cycle Stage: Inception		
Success Factor	**Community Type**	**Author**
Purpose Purpose Transparency of goals	Interest Support All	[Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Kim 2000] [Leimeister *et al.* 2005]
Focus Target Audience Focusing on one target group	All	[Andrews *et al.* 2001]
Codes of Conduct Establishing codes of behavior (netiquette and guidelines) to contain conflict potential Facilitator to monitor and control behavior	Interest All	[Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Kim 2000] [Preece 2000]
Trademark Building a strong trademark Tag line	All	[Kim 2000]
Funding/Revenue Sources Defining sources of revenue as a starting condition for building a virtual community Advertising and subscription fees	All	[Leimeister and Krcmar 2004]

Trademark: Kim [2000] emphasizes the need for a tagline that differentiates the community and expresses its nature. "*News for Nerds. Stuff that Matters*" is the tagline of Slashdot.org, an online community for open source enthusiasts. She suggests that an appealing tag would trigger, in the right audience, the desire to participate.

Funding and Revenue: Depending on the goals of the creator, sources of funding or revenue must be secured. Several options to fund online communities exist: private funding, membership fees, fee per use, advertising, among others.

From this list of success factors, Maloney-Krichmar and Preece [2005] found evidence of the importance of having a clear **purpose** in an online community of support for patients undergoing treatment for a knee condition.

Similarly, Leimeister and Krcmar [2003] found that **codes of conduct** are important in online communities of interest and support for cancer patients.

10.2 Creation

In the creation stage, creators select the technological components (e.g., website with bulletin boards, discussion forums, or chats) that will support the online community based on the needs of potential members and the purpose of the community (Table VIII). In this stage, a different set of success factors takes precedent over those implemented in the previous stage (developers should not lose sight of the importance of maintaining the success factors already implemented in the previous stage). In creating the community, creators must focus relentlessly on the needs of the users and must ensure that the tools are usable, that the supporting platform is reliable, that the personal member information is secure, and that all technology components have an adequate level of performance.

Table VIII. Online Community Success Factors for the Creation Stage

Life Cycle Stage: Creation		
Success Factor	**Community Type**	**Author**
User-centered Design and Evolution Evolution of the community according to the ideas of its members Knowing member preferences can maximize benefits to members Specific target groups Design with users in mind Focus on the needs of members	All	[Leimeister and Krcmar 2004] [Andrews 2001] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Kollock 1996] [Williams and Cothrel 2000] [Cothrel and Williams 1999] [Williams and Cothrel 2000]
Interface Usability Intuitive user guidance / usability Sophisticated user interface Ease of use Simple and easy to use interface	Gaming Support All	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005] [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005] [Preece 2000] [Nonnecke and Preece 2001] [Andrews *et al.* 2001]
Security and Privacy Handling member data sensitively Access-rights structure (privacy, security, authorization) Security	Interest Support	[Leimeister *et al.* 2005] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2004] [Andrews 2002] [Williams and Cothrel 2000] [Hummel and Lechner 2002]
Anonymity Discretionary levels of identity disclosure (from show all personal information to show none)	Game (show none) Support (discretionary)	[Hummel and Lechner 2002] [Leimeister *et al.* 2005]
Identity Persistence Ability to identify other members Ability to learn history of other members	Interest Support	[Hummel and Lechner 2002] [Kollock 1996]

Reliability Stability of the website Reliable interface	Interest Support All	[Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]
Performance Fast reaction time of the website Performance	Interest All	[Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2004]

Leimeister and Sidiras [2004] found that operators and members of online communities value **security and privacy** of their personal data very highly. Wegner *et al.* [2002] explain that as the community coalesces, it is important to develop a sense of trust and security. Similarly, Andrews [2002] advises that in order to encourage interaction, operators must guarantee privacy. Therefore, creators must ensure this member information is secure. Recent instances of crime among members of MySpace.com evidence this need [Romano 2006]. These incidents happened to a certain extent because members made their personal data easily available to other members.

In terms of the importance of each factor in communities of different types, Hummel and Lechner [2002] suggest that **interface usability** (i.e., ease of use and sophistication) is of primary importance for **gaming communities**. Maloney-Krichmar and Preece [2005] suggest that a simple but reliable interface is best for **communities of support**. Also, Kollock [1996] believes that member identity persistence, in the form of fixed usernames and user profiles, is necessary in online communities because it allows members to identify others in the community, know their history, and trust them. Discretionary levels of anonymity as opposed to complete anonymity are necessary in support communities because they promote relationship building, mutual support, and more private and offline interaction for those members who choose to meet each other in person. Hence, personal information should be kept secure and private but members should be left at liberty to reveal their own identity to members they select. In this regard, Leimeister *et al.* [2005] describe the implementation of four levels of anonymity in a community for cancer patients that range from "show everything in my profile" to "display nothing."

10.3 Growth

In the growth stage, word of the online community spreads and members join, while a culture with identity, common vocabulary, shared history, roles, and rituals begins to surface. In this stage, creators must ensure that new members visit the online community and join in, that their integration is smooth, and that up-to-date and quality content is offered. Trust building elements including clear identification of operators, accessible member profiles and, if available, sponsorships from reputable organizations should be incorporated as much as possible (Table IX).

Both Andrews [2002] and Leimeister et al. [2005] found that it is easier to attract new members if the online community clearly shows the identity of its operators (**transparency)** or is affiliated with a reputable organization. Similarly, Andrews [2002], Kim [2000], and Cothrel and Williams [1999] suggest that to encourage growth and facilitate word-of-mouth communication to attract new members, operators should organize community building activities such as **offline meetings or events.** These events will also help members know each other better. In this stage, Andres [2002] states that it is important to provide members with technology features that help them present their profile and contact information to the community.

Table IX. Online Community Success Factors for the Growth Stage

Life Cycle Stage: Growth		
Success Factor	**Community Type**	**Author**
Attracting Members Existence of an offline customer club as starting advantage Real life status symbols Actively encourage new members to join Offering privileges or bonus programs to members	Gaming Interest Transactions	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004]
Growth Management Continuous community-controlling with regard to growth of the number of members Sending reminders to contribute Setting numeric goals for contributions Framing similarities of opinion and uniqueness of contributions	Interest	[Beenen *et al.* 2004] [Ludford *et al.* 2004]
Integration of New Members Assistance for new members by experienced members Room for long term users and newcomers	Interest Support	[Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]
Up-to-date Content Offering up-to-date content Knowledge stewards to organize, upgrade, distribute knowledge Up-to-date Legitimization	Gaming Support	[Brazelton and Gorry 2003] [Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2004]
Content Quality Offering high-quality content Knowledge stewards to organize, upgrade, distribute knowledge Content generation by the host Interesting content Competent content management Quality of content	Knowledge Interest	[Brazelton and Gorry 2003] [Sangwan 2005] [Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2004] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Zhang and Hiltz 2003] [Leimeister *et al.* 2005]
Interaction Support Encouraging interaction between members Member directory, photographs and video clips, commenting features and recommender systems	Knowledge Game Interest	[Zhang and Hiltz 2003]
Trust Building Building trust among the members Member directory, photographs and video clips, commenting features and recommender systems and matching profiles Clear identification of operators Member profiles Transparency of providers	Knowledge Support Interest Gaming All	[Zhang and Hiltz 2003] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Donath 1999] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Kollock 1996] [Kapoor, Konstan *et al.* 2005] [Kim 2000] [Leimeister *et al.* 2005]

Neutrality/non-partisan offers Sustaining neutrality when presenting and selecting offers		[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
Reaching Critical Mass Reaching a high number of members within a short period of time		[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
Transparency Increase of market transparency for community members Trustworthy operators Affiliation to established, reputable organizations	Support Interest	[Andrews 2002] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Leimeister *et al.* 2005]
Personalization of Portal Personalized page design of the community site according to the preferences of its members	Game	[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
Personalization of Offers Personalized product and service offers for community members		[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
Offline Events and Meetings Supporting the community by regular real-world meetings		[Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Kim 2000] [Cothrel and Williams 1999]

Success factors in this stage are important for all types of communities but personalization is especially important for **game communities** since their members value a sophisticated interface that gives them a sense of place [Hummel and Lechner, 2000].

10.4 Maturity

If successful in previous stages, online communities mature into formal organizations. Creators and operators need to focus on their sustainability and continued success. At maturity, a critical mass of members and member-generated content is achieved. Researchers advise that creators and managers facilitate the formation of subgroups, delegate control to volunteer subgroup managers, organize online events, and reward and acknowledge members' participation and contributions [Andrews 2002; Ginsburg and Weisband 2004]. As member contributions reach a new height, the formation of subgroups and the permeation of control to facilitate subgroup discussion help decrease information and administration overload for members and operators [Andrews 2002; Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005]. Jones and Rafaeli [2000] emphasize the need to allow **subgroup formations** and to facilitate interaction and discussion on different subtopics of interest or for different types of members. For example, Maloney-Krichmar and Preece [2005] found that in an online community of support for patients undergoing treatment it is important to provide different spaces, one for patients and one for members of their families, in order to provide a sense of intimacy. Table X details success factors in this stage.

The success factor that earns the most attention in this stage is **recognition of members' contributions**. Members who are loyal or who contribute or participate actively as volunteers should be rewarded by acknowledging them by name, with gifts, or simply by providing them with feedback. **Volunteerism** is especially important for **game communities** so that they can provide 24/7 member support. **Subgroup management** is

especially important for **interest** and **support communities** in order to reduce information overload and provide a sense of intimacy.

Table X. Online Community Success Factors for the Maturity Stage

Life Cycle Stage: Maturity		
Success Factor	**Community Type**	**Author**
Regular Online Events Arranging regular events	Interest Gaming	[Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Williams and Cothrel 2000]
Sales and Offers Price efficiency of offered products and services Sales Constant extensions of offerings		[Leimeister and Krcmar 2004] [Leimeister and Sidiras 2004]
User Tools Tools for working with shared materials Recommender systems to match user profile Commenting systems Search engines Document storage and sharing	Knowledge	[Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Zhang and Hiltz 2003]
Permeated Management and Control Integration of the members into the administration of the community Volunteers are critical to provide 24/7 service Distributed delegation to group operators Support for volunteerism Membership roles Facilitators to monitor and control behavior Invitation only-subgroups	Interest Gaming Support	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Williams and Cothrel 2000] [Kim 2000] [Cothrel and Williams 1999]
Recognition of Contributions Appreciation of contribution of the members by the operators Recognize existing volunteers with explicit reward model Real life status symbols (identity of contributors) Recognition of participation: by name, identity, positive feedback Recognizing uniqueness of contribution and benefits to the group Extrinsic Rewards: gift, social recognition, feedback Visibility of contribution Incentives must match user values	Gaming Interest	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Chan 2004] [Andrews 2001] [Beenen *et al.* 2004] [Hars and Ou 2002] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Butler *et al.* 2005] [Hall and Graham 2004] [Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005]
Subgroup Management Establishing and supporting sub-groups within the community Use of channels to segment communications (communities of interests) Support for permeable subgroups Virtual space with an appropriate communication	Gaming Support	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Maloney-Krichmar and Preece 2005] [Jones and Rafaeli 2000] [Leimeister and Krcmar 2003] [Andrews *et al.* 2001] [Hall and Graham 2004] [Kim 2000]

channel Narrowly focused discussion forums Flexible gathering places		
Recognition of Loyalty Special treatment of loyal members Recognizes existing volunteers with an explicit reward model (free membership/ status in volunteer chain) Recognition (identity, expertise, tangible recognition) Extrinsic Rewards: gift, social recognition, feedback	Gaming	[Ginsburg and Weisband 2004] [Andrews 2002] [Chan 2004] [Tedjamulia *et al.* 2005] [Butler *et al.* 2005] [Hars and Ou 2002]
Member Satisfaction Management Continuous community-controlling with regards to member satisfaction Focus on user needs	All	[Leimeister and Sidiras 2004] [Cothrel and Williams 1999]

10.5 Sustainability or Death

Once online communities mature, they may take several paths. Some sustain themselves and continue to grow and succeed, others change course, and a few cease to exist. Wegner et al. [2002] explain that people may begin to leave the community when it is no longer useful to them. However, if the community achieves sustainability in this stage, benefits begin to accrue. At maturity, Malhotra *et al.* [1999] ascertain that the identity of the community consolidates and collective action may begin. On the other hand, if communities experience poor participation, lack of quality content, unorganized contribution, and transient membership [Jarvenpaa and Knoll 1998] their termination may be eminent.

Table XI. Determinants of Online Community Termination

Life Cycle Stage: Death		
Success Factor	**Community Type**	**Author**
Undersupply of content Poor participation Unorganized contribution Transient membership Members with weak ties Willingness to share information Lack of Anonymity Concerns of privacy and safety Shyness about public posting Time limitations	All	[Jarvenpaa and Knoll 1998] [Nonnecke and Preece 2001] [Iriberri 2005] [Zhang and Hiltz 2003] [Constant, Kiesler *et al.* 1994]

Iriberri [2005] found evidence to suggest that members would not contribute content to the community if they are concerned about their identity being known, if contribution is unorganized, and if content is undersupplied.

These termination conditions seem to apply to all online social spaces [Desanctis and Roeach 2002]. Table XI lists conditions for online community termination.

As discussed, existing research have tested isolated success factors for online community success. However, sytematically integrating these succes factors according to the growth and needs of the community, as we have done, will optimize the use of development resources and maximize online community success.

11. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Researchers and practitioners in different disciplines are studying conditions that lead to lively and sustainable online communities. We reviewed this literature and organized success factors based on the information system life cycle, the community life cycle and the type or genre of community. Online communities evolve following distinctive life cycle stages where user and operator needs change. As a result, different technology features are needed depending on the need and the development stage of the online community. An integrated and organized view of factors that lead to success, as opposed to a list of isolated factors, can facilitate development and maximize success. Information systems researchers and online community builders interested in creating lively and sustainable communities where members participate willingly and contribute actively will benefit from this detailed review and integration of the conditions that will lead their online communities to succeed

The complexity and diversity of online communities make them a challenging subject of research. Existing research, although valuable, has produced snapshot-views of online communities. Future research should focus on the dynamic nature of online communities and test, for example, whether the proposed order that we propose in which factors should be implemented leads to more or less success, and if and how these factors interact to promote success. Other efforts could focus on understanding the needs of different types of users (i.e., gender, age, and ethnicity). Online community designers will benefit from further research on how to implement these factors to ensure an optimal development process and maximum success.

REFERENCES

AHITUV, N. and NEUMANN, S. 1982. *Principles of Information Systems for Management*. Wm. C. Brown Publisher, Dubuque, IA.

ALAVI, M., CARLSON, P. and BROOKE, G. 1989. The ecology of MIS research: A twenty year status review. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Information Systems*, Boston, MA, December 1989, J. DEGROSS, J. HENDERSON, and B. KONSYNSKI, Eds. ACM, New York, NY, 363-375.

ALEM, L. and KRAVIS, S. 2005. Design and evaluation of an online learning community: A case study at CSIRO. *ACM SIGGROUP Bulletin 25(1)*. ACM New York, NY, USA, 20-24.

ANDREWS, D. C. 2001. Considerations in the development of commercially based online communities. *Proceedings of the Seventh Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Boston, MA, USA, August 2001, D. STRONG, D. STRAUB, and J. DEGROSS, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA

ANDREWS, D. C. 2002. Audience-specific online community design. *Communications of the ACM 45(4)*, 64-68.

ANDREWS, D. C., PREECE, J. and TUROFF, M. 2001. A conceptual framework for demographic groups resistant to online community interaction. *Proceedings of the 34th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2001, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

ARNOLD, Y., LEIMEISTER, J. M. and KRCMAR, H. 2003. CoPEP: A development process model for a community platform for cancer patients. *Proceedings of the Eleventh European Conference on Information Systems*, June 2003, Naples, Italy.

BAJARIN, T. 2007. The future of social networking. *PC Magazine*

BALLER, S. and GREEN, H. 2005. Blogs will change your business. BusinessWeek. 3931: 56.

BBC NEWS. 2005. Website support for self-harmers. Retrieved April 18, 2006, 2006, from

http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/em/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/england/suffolk/4440754.stm.

BEENEN, G., LING, K., WANG, X., CHANG, K., FRANKOWSKI, D., RESNICK, P. and KRAUT, R. E. 2004. Using social psychology to motivate contributions to online communities. *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Group*, Chicago, Illinois, 2004, ACM, New York, NY, USA.

BLANCHARD, A. L. 2004. The Effects of dispersed virtual communities on face-to-face social capital. In *Social Capital and Information Technology,* M. HUYSMAN and V. WULF, Eds. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 53-74.

BLANCHARD, A. L. and HORAN, T. 1998. Social capital and virtual communities. *Social Science Computer Review 16(3)*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 293-307

BLANCHARD, A. L. and MARKUS, M. L. 2004. The experienced "sense" of a virtual community: Characteristics and processes. *Data Base for Advances in Information Systems 35(1)*, 65-79.

BRAZELTON, J. and GORRY, G. A. 2003. Creating a knowledge-sharing community: if you build it, will they come? *Communications of the ACM 46(2)*, 23-25.

BURKETT, S. 2006. The Life Cycle of Online Community Members. Pothole on the Infobahn

BUTLER, B., SPROULL, L., KIESLER, S. and KRAUT, R. E. 2005. Community effort in online groups: Who does the work and why? In *Leadership at a Distance,* S. WEISBAND and L. ATWATER Eds. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc, Mahwah, NJ.

CARVER, C. 1999. Building a virtual Community for a tele-learning environment. *IEEE Communications Magazine 37(3)*, 114-118.

CHABOUDY, R. and JAMESON, P. 2001. Connecting families and school through technology. *Book Report 20(2)*, 52-57.

CHAN, C., M. L. 2004. Recognition and participation in a virtual community. *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2004, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

CHEN, W. and HIRSCHHEIM, R. 2004. A paradigmatic and methodological examination of information systems research from 1991 to 2001. *Information Systems Journal 14*.

CONLIN, M. 2005. E-Mail Is so five minutes ago. *BusinessWeek* (*3961*), 111.

CONSTANT, D., KIESLER, S. and SPROULL, L. 1994. What's mine is ours, or is it? A study of attitudes about information sharing. *Information Science Research 5(4)*, 400-421.

COTHREL, J. and WILLIAMS, R. L. 1999. On-line communities: Helping them form and grow. *Journal of Knowledge Management 3(1)*, 54-60.

CUMMINGS, J. N., BUTLER, B. and KRAUT, R. E. 2002. The quality of online social relationships. *Communications of the ACM 45(7)*, 103-108.

DESANCTIS, G. and ROEACH, M. 2002. Age, size, and contribution dynamics in online learning communities. *Academy of Management Conference,* Denver, CO, 2002.

DONATH, J. 1999. Identity and deception in the virtual community. In *Communities in Cyberspace,* M. SMITH and P. KILLOCK Eds. Rutledge, London, 29-58.

EZZY, E. 2006. Social networking: Time for a silver bullet. Read/WriteWeb

FACEBOOK. 2007. Press Room: Statistics. From http://www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics.

FICHTER, D. 2005. The many forms of e-collaboration: Blogs, wikis, portals, groupware, discussion boards, and instant messaging. *Online 29(4)*, 48-50.

GINSBURG, M. and WEISBAND, S. 2004. A framework for virtual community business success: The case of the Internet Chess Club. *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2004, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

GOODNOE, E. 2006. Wiki while you work. *InformationWeek* (*1078*), 3.

GUPTA, S. and KIM, H.-W. 2004. Virtual community: Concepts, implications, and future research directions. *Proceedings of the Tenth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, New York, USA, August 2004, C. BULLEN, E. STOHR, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

HAGEL, J. I. and ARMSTRONG, A. G. 1997. *Net Gain: Expanding Markets through Virtual Communities*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

HALL, H. and GRAHAM, D. 2004. Creation and recreation: Motivating collaboration to generate knowledge capital in online communities. *International Journal of Information Management 24*(*3*), 235-246.

HAMPTON, K. N. 2003. Grieving for a lost network: Collective action in a wired suburb. *The Information Society 19*, 417-428.

HAMPTON, K. N. and WELLMAN, B. 1999. Netville online and offline: Observing and surveying a wired suburb. *American Behavioral Scientist 43*(*3*), 475-492.

HARS, A. and OU, S. 2002. Working for Free? - Motivations of participating in open source projects. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce 6*(*3*), 25-39.

HILTZ, S. R. and GOLDMAN, R., Eds. 2004. *Learning Online Together: Research on Asynchronous Learning Network.*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ, USA.

HOLMES, S. 2006. Nike, Google kick off social-networking site. *BusinessWeek Online.*

HUMMEL, J. and LECHNER, U. 2002. Social profiles of virtual communities. *Proceedings of the 35th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2002, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

IRIBERRI, A. 2005 Conference. Building online community: An action research project. *Proceedings of the Eleventh Americas Conference on Information Systems, Omaha, NE, USA, August 2005, N. ROMANO, Ed. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.*

JARVENPAA, S. L. and KNOLL, K. 1998. Is anybody out there? Antecedents of trust in global virtual teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems 14*, 29-65.

JOHNSON, J. and AMBROSE, P. J. 2006. Neo-tribes: The power and potential of online communities in health care. *Communications of the ACM 49*(*1*), 107-113.

JONES, Q. and RAFAELI, S. 2000. Time to split, virtually: 'Disclosure architecture' and 'community building' as means to creating vibrant virtual monopolies. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce and Business Media 32*(*187-200*).

KAPOOR, N., KONSTAN, J. A. and TERVEEN, L. G. 2005 Conference. How peer photos influence member participation in online communities. *CHI'05 Extended Abstracts on Human Factor in Computer Systems*, Portland, OR, USA, 2005, ACM New York, USA.

KATZ, J. E. and RICE, R. E. 2002. *Social consequences of Internet Use: Access, Involvement, and Interaction*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

KIM, A. J. 2000. *Community Building on the Web*. Peachpit Press, Berkeley, CA.

KLING, R. and COURTRIGHT, C. 2003. Group behavior and learning in electronic forums: A sociotechnical approach. *The Information Society 19*, 221-235.

KOH, J., KIM, Y.-G. and BOCK, G.-W. 2007. Encouraging participation in virtual communities. *Communications of the ACM 50*(*2*), 6.

KOLLOCK, P. 1996. Design principles for online communities. *Harvard Conference on the Internet and Society.*

KRAUT, R. E., KIESLER, S., BONEVA, B., CUMMINGS, J. N., HELGEGSON, V. and CRAWFORD, A. 2002. Internet paradox revisited. *Journal of Social Issues 58*(*1*), 49-74.

KRAUT, R. E., PATTERSON, M., LUNDMARK, V., KIM, H.-W., MUKHOPADHYAY, T. and SCHERLIS, W. 1996. Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and psychological well being? *American Psychologist 53*(*9*), 1011-1031.

LAZAR, J. and PREECE, J. 1998. Classification schema for online communities. *Proceedings of the Fourth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Baltimore, MN, USA, August 1998, E. HOADLEY and I. BENBASAT, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

LEE, F. S. L., VOGEL, D. and LIMAYEM, M. 2003. Virtual community informatics: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application 5(1)*, 47-61.

LEIMEISTER, J. M., EBNER, W. and KRCMAR, H. 2005. Design, implementation, and evaluation of trust-supporting components in virtual communities for patients. *Journal of Management Information Systems 21(4)*, 101-135.

LEIMEISTER, J. M. and KRCMAR, H. 2003. Engineering virtual communities in heath care: The case of www.krebsgemeinschaft.de. *Electronic Journal of Organizational Virtualness 5(3)*.

LEIMEISTER, J. M. and KRCMAR, H. 2004. Revisiting the virtual community business model. *Proceedings of the Tenth Americas Conference on Information Systems,* New York, NY, USA, August 2004, C. BULLEN, E. STOHR, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

LEIMEISTER, J. M. and SIDIRAS, P. 2004. Success factors of virtual communities from the perspective of members and operators: An empirical study. *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2004, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

LI, H. 2004. Virtual community studies: A literature review, synthesis and research agenda. *Proceedings of the Tenth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, New York, NY, USA, August 2004, C. BULLEN, E. STOHR, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

LUDFORD, P. J., COSLEY, D., FRANKOWSLY, D. and TERVEEN, L. G. 2004. Think different: Increasing online community participation using uniqueness and group dissimilarities. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Humand Factors in computing Systems, Vienna, Austria, ACM, New York, NY, USA.

MALHOTRA, A., GOSAIN, S. and HARS, A. 1997. Evolution of a virtual community: understanding design issues through a longitudinal study. *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Information Systems*, Atlanta, GA, USA, December 1997, J. DEGROSS and K. KUMAR, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

MALONEY-KRICHMAR, D. and PREECE, J. 2005. A multilevel analysis of sociability, usability, and community dynamics in an online health community. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction 12(2)*, 201-232.

MILLEN, D. R., FONTAINE, M. A. and MULLER, M. J. 2002. Understanding the benefit and costs of communities of practice. *Communications of the ACM,* 45(4), 69-73.

NEWS CORPORATION, I. 2007. Press Release. MySpace outperforms all other social networking sites. Retrieved September 7, 2007.

NONNECKE, B. and PREECE, J. 2000. Lurker demographics: counting the silent. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems.* The Hague, The Netherlands, 2000, ACM, New York, NY, USA.

NONNECKE, B. and PREECE, J. 2001. Why lurkers lurk. *Proceedings of the Seventh Americas Conference on Information Systems,* Boston, MA, USA, August 2001, D. STRONG, D. STRAUB and J. DEGROSS, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

PARAMESWARAN, M. and WHINSTON, A. B. 2007. Social computing: An overview. *Communications of the AIS 19*, 762-780.

PEW INTERNET & AMERICAN LIFE PROJECT. 2007. Latest Trends: Online Activities. Retrieved September 7, 2007, 2007, from www.PewInternet.org.

PREECE, J. 1998. Emphatic communities: Reaching out across the web. *Interactions* 2, 32-43.

PREECE, J. 1999. Emphatic communities: Balancing emotional and factual communication. *Interacting with Computers 12*, 63-77.

PREECE, J. 2000. *Online Communities: Designing Usability, Supporting Sociability*. Wiley, New York.

PREECE, J. 2001a. Sociability and usability in online communities: Determining and measuring success. *Behavior and Information Technology Journal 20(5)*, 347-356.

PREECE, J. 2001b. Sociability and usability: Twenty years of chatting online. *Behavior and Information Technology Journal 20(5)*, 347-356.

PREECE, J. and MALONEY-KRICHMAR, D. 2003. Online communities. In *Handbook of Human-Computer Interaction*, J. JACKO and A. SEARS, Eds. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., Mahwah, NJ.

REID, M. and GRAY, C. 2007. Online Social Networks, Virtual Communities, Enterprises, and Information Professionals - Part. 1 Past and Present. *Searcher* 15.

RESNICK, P. and ZECKHAUSER, R. 2002. Trust among strangers in internet transactions: Empirical analysis of eBay's reputation system. In *The Economics of the Internet and E-Commerce*, M. R. BAYE, Ed. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam

RHEINGOLD, H. 1993. *The Virtual Community. Homesteading in the Electronic Frontier*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA.

RIDINGS, C., GEFEN, D. and ARINZE, B. 2006. Psychological barriers: Lurker and poster motivations and behavior in online communities. *Communications of the AIS 18*, 329-354.

RIDINGS, C. M. and GEFEN, D. 2004. Virtual community attraction: Why people hang out online. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication 10(1)*.

ROMANO, A. 2006. Walking a new beat. *Newsweek*. CXLVII**:** 48.

SANGWAN 2005. Virtual community success: A uses and gratification perspective. *Proceedings of the 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2005, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

STANOEVSKA-SLABEVA, K. and SCHMID, B. F. 2000. Requirements analysis for community supporting platforms based on the media reference model. *Electronic Markets 10(4), 250-257*.

STANOEVSKA-SLABEVA, K. and SCHMID, B. F. 2001. *Proceedings of the 34th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2001, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

SZABO, L. 2006. Kids with cancer bond online. *The Daily Advertiser*. Lafayette, LA.

TEDJAMULIA, S. J. J., OLSEN, D. R., DEAN, D. L. and ALBRECHT, C. C. 2005. Motivating content contributions to online communities: Towards a more comprehensive theory. *Proceedings of the 38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, January 2005, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA.

TOTTY, M. 2007. Technology: How to be a star in a YouTube world. *The Wall Street Journal*. New York, N. Y.

TURKLE, S. 1995. *Life on the screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*. Simon and Shuster, New York.

WANG, Y. and FESENMAIER, D. 2004. Towards understanding member's general participation and active contribution to an online travel community. *Tourism Management 25*, 709-722.

WASKO, M. and TEIGLAND, R. 2004. Public goods or virtual commons? Applying theories of public goods, social dilemmas and collective action to electronic networks of practice. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application 6(1)*, 25-42.

WEGNER, E., MCDERMOTT, R. and SNYDER, W. 2002. *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*. Harvard Business Review.

WELLMAN, B. 2005. Community: From neighborhood to network. *Communications of the ACM,* 48(10), 53-55.

WELLMAN, B., SALAFF, J., DIMITROVA, D., GARTON, L. and HAYTHORNWAITE, C. 1996. Computer networks as social networks: Collaborative work, telework, and virtual community. *Annual Review of Sociology 22*, 213-238.

WILLIAMS, R. L. and COTHREL, J. 2000. Four smart ways to run online communities. *Sloan Management Review*, 81-91.

ZHANG, Y., BOT, R. and HILTZ, S. R. 2001. Building a virtual community for ALN. *Proceedings of the Seventh Americas Conference on Information Systems,* Boston, MA, USA, August 2001, D. STRONG, D. STRAUB and J. DEGROSS, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.

ZHANG, Y. and HILTZ, S. R. 2003. Factors that influence online relationship development in a knowledge sharing community. *Proceedings of the Ninth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, Tampa, FL, USA, August 2003, D. GALLETA and J. ROSS, Eds. AIS, Atlanta, GA, USA.