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Examine how organizational social capital in different types of groups is affected by use of SNS sites.

A survey study of IBM's Beehive internal social networking site (SNS), focused on observing its effect on employee behavior.

Findings indicate that using Beehive for a relatively short time (6 mo), the employees built closer ties with their co-workers and had a higher sense of belongingness.
Beyond Bowling Together

- How can socio-technical capital inform the design of HCI systems?
- Context – social capital in the US has been declining since the 1950s, as indicated by Putnam in his celebrated research
- Do we need new ways to foster and build social capital on collaborative systems and environments?
  - New forms of togetherness with the aid of technology
  - Domains – civic sector, education, workplace
Cite example of one traditional workplace activity that cannot be accomplished without leveraging socio-technical capital.
Can socio-technical capital as enabled by new technologies in a workplace increase productivity?
How does socio-technical capital help coordination of independent actions?
Crowdsourcing systems show that strangers when brought together can accomplish many things. Does it, in a way, show that in this new era, socio-technical capital is perhaps not as key for success as Resnick assumed?
In a situation where work is accomplished by exploiting social capital, who takes ownership of the work? Also problems with collective identity of a group.
Socio-technical capital is often associated with collective identity of the people involved in an activity. This can be great if identities are revealed. What explains the success of anonymous systems then?
Is socio-technical capital always a good thing for social mobilization?
Putnam said (and Resnick recognized) about the declining nature of social capital in American social life. Can technology truly be the answer?