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1. Introduction

Knowledge management (KM) is "one of the key enabling technologies of distributed engineering enterprises" [McMahon et al. 2004]. However, its adoption in the engineering industry is minimal [Vijaykumar and Chakrabarti 2008]. The ultimate goal of KM is applying the knowledge, in other words, turning knowledge into effective action [Alavi and Leidner 2001]. One reason for the lack of adoption of KM in the industry may be that "most studies concentrate their work on collection, storage and transfer of knowledge" but "whether knowledge is finally applied is neither supported nor measured" [Schacht and Maedche 2016]. Since the success of KM is determined by the application of knowledge, companies may not want to invest in KM because of the few support and evidence regarding knowledge application.

Successful KM requires a deep understanding of the barriers involved [Storey and Barnett 2000]. With the objective of understanding what leads to knowledge application, we conducted a literature review to collect the barriers in KM. A barrier represents an undesirable state of an influencing factor. Both terms are interchangeably used in literature so, while conveying the literature research, we always looked for both. From now on we will only refer to the neutral term factor.

According to [Webster and Watson 2002], major contributions in a field should be in the leading journals; thus, we performed a review in those of the engineering design (ED) field: Journal of Engineering Design, Design Studies, and Research in Engineering Design. We reviewed the table of contents of these journals in the last five years and we did not find any detailed study regarding the factors influencing knowledge application.

Contrary to ED, literature in the field of KM provides numerous studies that discuss the factors influencing successful knowledge application. We conducted 6 semi-structured interviews with design engineers from the Bavarian automotive industry and we asked them about their problems applying knowledge. They named factors listed in the KM literature like, for example, the structure of the repositories or the language. Therefore, we assume that reviewing journals in the superordinate field of KM will bring us factors which are representative of the ED field. Thus, we collected influencing factors for knowledge application presented in the papers of the most relevant KM journals.

During the literature review we realized that factors are analysed and classified using different KM models which are not comparable. [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015] argued that this lack of consensus in the KM model hampers understanding the real influence of the factors in successful KM and, therefore, proposing solutions to overcome the barriers. Besides, authors often focused on organizational processes and functionalities of KM solutions rather than on individual's behaviour [Schacht and Maedche 2016].
But individuals are the ones applying the knowledge and therefore, they should constitute the focus of understanding what leads to successful knowledge application. In order to unify the influencing factors for knowledge application in one model that considers the individual as central element, [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015] proposed the Worker-Centered-Model (WCM). The WCM represents an attempt to understand a phenomenon that has been rarely studied (knowledge application) from a point of view that has been little considered despite its significance (individuals point of view).

In the paper at hand, we present the literature review of influencing factors for knowledge application that we conducted within KM journals. We use the WCM to structure the factors and allow their comparison. We obtained as final result 21 influencing factors classified into 4 categories: infrastructure, knowledge, psycho-social, and strategic factors.

The paper is structured as follows: section 2 presents the Worker-Centered Model, section 3 explains the research methodology, section 4 presents and discusses the results, section 5 presents the conclusions and summarized result, and section 6 describes the further work.

2. The Worker-Centered Model

The Worker-Centered Model (WCM) represents "the factors influencing knowledge application during knowledge intensive activities from the point of view of the knowledge worker" [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015] A knowledge worker is defined as "a worker whose main capital is his knowledge" [Goncalves 2012]. The model does not only allow the consideration of a single individual but also of different knowledge units in the organization such as groups of individuals or groups of individuals with documented knowledge (see Figure 1a). The boundaries of the knowledge unit subject of study are flexible and they must be defined depending on the particular purposes of the study that uses the model.
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**Figure 1.** a) WCM view of the organization; b) Factors influencing the knowledge processes and their relations

The model proposes three main knowledge processes to which influent factors are one-to-one allocated. The three processes considered and their factors influencing them are depicted in Figure 1b:

- Knowledge transfer: "the process by which knowledge available within one unit of the organization (individual, team or a division of organization) is made available to other unit(s) of the organization" [Manohar and Gupta 2014]. Knowledge transfer is influenced by factors related to the company’s infrastructure. Knowledge transfer influences directly knowledge integration/creation.
- Knowledge integration/creation: process of integrating external knowledge with previously existing internal knowledge in order to create "new knowledge" [Grant 1996] Knowledge integration/creation is influenced by factors related to the knowledge itself. Knowledge integration/creation has a moderating role on the impact of knowledge transfer on knowledge.
application [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015] and it influences knowledge application through the fact that the "new created knowledge" influences the psycho-social factors like for example the individual attitude towards applying knowledge.

- Knowledge application: process where the "knowledge is turned into effective action" [Alavi and Leidner 2001]. Knowledge application is influenced by socio-psychological factors. It is the source of competitive advantage [Alavi and Leidner 2001] and leads to knowledge transfer because, every time an action is conducted, its effects can be observed, therefore, transferred.

Strategic alignment affects infrastructure, knowledge, and psycho-social factors [Zack 1999]. Strategic alignment can be considered as an exception in this one-to-one factor-process allocation because the factors in this category do not directly influence a process but the factors of the other three categories as Figure 1b shows. The infrastructure, knowledge, and psycho-social factors influence directly one process, but indirectly the other two. Factors classified into strategic alignment influence directly the factors of the other three categories, and indirectly the three knowledge processes. The transparent factor-process representation simplifies the analysis of failures in knowledge application. The model is used in this paper as the basis for understanding and structuring the factors collected from the literature review. Thus, the paper contributes also extending the model.

3. Research methodology

To collect the factors from literature and analyse them, we followed the procedure described in Figure 2, which consists of seven steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Selection of the leading journals</strong></td>
<td>Location: Web of Science Keywords: Knowledge Management AND (Barrier OR Factor) in all text fields Time window: Between 2005 and 2015 Selection criteria: The 3 non-proceeding journals with greatest number of citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Selection of relevant papers</strong></td>
<td>Location: The three selected research journals Keywords: Barrier OR Factor in the title Time window: Between 2005 and 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Collection of all factors</strong></td>
<td>Collection all factors in an Excel sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Filtering of out of scope factors</strong></td>
<td>Out of scope criteria: - The factor is too abstractly defined - The factor impact crosses firm’s boundaries - The factor is a process or strategy itself - The factor is a variable of individuals' behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Filtering of duplicated factors</strong></td>
<td>Duplicates Criteria: - Exact duplicates - The factor is written as barrier or vice versa - Synonyms and antonyms - The meaning of a factor is contained into another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Classification into the four WCM categories</strong></td>
<td>Classify the factors into the four categories of the WCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7 Grouping into similar factors</strong></td>
<td>Grouping of similar factors into more widely described ones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Procedure to collect and analyse the factors**

1. Selection of the leading journals. We selected the leading journals because the major contributions to the topic (factors influencing knowledge application) are likely to be there
[Webster and Watson 2002]. We used Web of Science as reference and searched in all text fields with the term "knowledge management AND (barrier OR factor)". Then, we selected the three journals with the greatest number of results between 2005 and 2015: Journal of Knowledge Management, Knowledge Management Research and Practice, and Information and Management.

2. Selection of relevant papers. We selected all papers from these journals between the years 2005 and 2015 that contained in the title the words "factor" or "barrier". We did not use the term "knowledge management" as search criteria because we supposed all papers in these KM journals were covering KM topics. As a result, we selected 30 papers from the Journal of Knowledge Management, 93 from Knowledge Management Research and Practice, and 44 from Information and Management. However, we were later obligated to discard the 9 papers from the Knowledge Management Research and Practice journal since we had only access to 15 of them.

3. Collection of all factors. We extracted all factors present in the 31 of the 34 papers. Three had no factors so we discarded them. In total, we collected 364 factors.

4. Filtering of out of scope factors. Since the selection of papers was made with little restrictive criteria and the authors of the different papers define the factors in many different ways, we added a scope criteria not at the paper level but at the factors level. 68 factors like the absorptive capacity are too abstractly defined to fit into the WCM. According to [Cohen and Levinthal 1990], absorptive capacity refers not only to assimilate, but also to apply the knowledge; this means that absorptive capacity influences two processes of the WCM: knowledge integration/creation and knowledge application. Besides, [Cohen and Levinthal 1990] define absorptive capacity as the factor that influence the performance of both integrating/creating and applying knowledge, so it can be understood as the sum of all psycho-social and knowledge-related factors. We also did not consider 21 factors like "Clash of personalities between the organizations (especially among top management)" that crossed firm’s boundaries, 10 factors like "knowledge transference" or "personalization knowledge" that in fact were not factors but knowledge processes or strategies themselves, and 11 like "affirmative effect" or "lack of positive attitude" because they are variables that predict individuals behaviour. Apart from the affirmative effect, which represents the irrational component of individuals' behaviour [Jang and Ko 2014], the other factors refer to Ajzen’s [1991] theory of planned behaviour. The WCM uses the theory of planned behaviour to explain how psyclo-social factors influence knowledge application in the same way it uses Nonaka’s [1994] SECI model to explain how knowledge-related factors influence knowledge integration/creation. This means that the

1 Papers not explicitly cited in text are referenced providing the DOI in endnotes
affirmative effect, attitude toward the behaviour, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control are variables of individual’s behaviours located between psycho-social factors like culture or trust and the process of knowledge application. Thus, we do not consider these variables factors themselves and they are out of the scope of this paper.

5. Filtering of duplicated factors. Many factors were exact duplicates, many others not but referred to the same concept. Because a barrier is the undesirable state of a factor [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015], many papers define barriers, others define factors. If the same concept is defined as barrier in one paper and as factor in other (relationship and arduous relationship for example), one (or more) of the two (or more) repeated factor is eliminated as duplicate. Some factors like trust and untrustworthiness were synonyms or antonyms and one (or more) of them were removed as duplicate. The fourth criteria for filtering duplicates were that one factor was more restrictively defined than the other; in other words, one factor is contained into the other, for example interpersonal trust is more restrictedly defined than trust. We filtered out 112 factors as duplicated; by eliminating them we obtained a final list of 142 items.

6. Classification into the four WCM categories. In order to be able to understand how each of the 142 factors influences knowledge application, we classified them into the four categories of the WCM: infrastructure-related factors, knowledge-related factors, psycho-social factors, and strategic alignment. For the case of this paper, we renamed all categories apart from the third one: infrastructure factors, knowledge factors, psycho-social factors, and strategic factors. The criteria for classifying each one of the 142 factors into the four categories was analysing which process is directly influenced by the factor; for example, we classified trash information into infrastructure factors because mountains of useless documented knowledge hampers people from finding the knowledge they need, it makes slower and more inefficient the transfer of knowledge through the boundaries of the knowledge unit. This classification is presented in section 4.

7. Grouping into similar factors. Because 142 factors are quite too much and unmanageable, and because some authors talked about barriers and others about factors, we grouped the factors into 21 we defined in a neutral way; this means that we defined the 21 as factors and not as barriers. This grouping is explained in detail in section 4.

4. Results and discussion
Following the seventh point in the methodology, we grouped the factors and barriers into 21 categories, which are also classified in the four categories of the WCM. The following sections analyse this grouping and classification: section 4.1 explains the infrastructure factors, section 4.2 the knowledge factors, section 4.3 the psycho-social factors, and section 4.4 the strategic factors.

4.1 Infrastructure factors
Infrastructure factors are defined as those that ease or hamper the transfer of knowledge from one knowledge unit to another by means of crossing the boundaries of both units [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015]. Companies’ infrastructure comprises organizational and technical means that define the transfer channels in the company. The latter can also be divided into the IT systems and the physical layout of the buildings. Thus, we differentiate three factors: organizational structure, physical structure, and IT structure. From our experience, the three factors are tightly interrelated and one should support the others; it is quite useless if we define a process for knowledge transfer based, for example, in a personalization strategy and we modify the organizational structure but the IT or the physical structure are not shaped in consequence. Explaining an easy example, imagine that two head engineers of two different centres of competence (CoCs) which are located in different countries and collaborate in the same mechanical design have weekly meetings to coordinate the design process. Imagine that both CoCs have schedule the activities of the different people (organizational structure) to exchange the greatest amount of knowledge; however, the conference device (IT structure) has a very bad performance interrupting the conversation the whole time and allowing these head engineers to transfer only the third of the knowledge they intended in a one-hour meeting. Bringing these two people together in the same room (physical structure) makes no sense because it requires almost one-day traveling by plane. To face
this situation they could change the organizational organization setting three hours meetings instead of
one hour (modifying the organizational structure to influence knowledge transfer), bring both CoCs to
the same location (modifying the physical structure), update to better conference devices (modifying the
IT structure), or think of using a codification instead of a personalization strategy; a change in
the knowledge strategy that has not only implications in the knowledge transfer (infrastructure factors) but
also in the other two knowledge processes. This interrelation among factors, therefore, are not the
exclusive preserve of the infrastructure factors, but to the 21 factor groups object of this study; for
example, the one-hour meeting can also be a failure if at least one of the head engineers does not properly
speak English, and they have no other verbal way for communicating each other. Thus, this coordination
among factors is responsibility of the strategic factors, which are explained in section 4.4.

Classifying the factors into the three infrastructure factors categories was not an easy task; each author
defines the factors and barriers en many different ways. Simple versus complex knowledge, for example,
can seem to be a knowledge factor; however, it refers to the complexity of the distribution of the
knowledge in the company [Kamesh and Jolly 2008], which is part of the organizational structure.
Consequently, we will consider the three groups of factors (organizational, IT, and physical structure),
which are neutrally defined, as factors themselves, and the factors and barriers defined by other authors
object of this study as examples that support and help understanding the three factors we defined. The
same also applies to the knowledge, phycho-social, and strategic factors.

4.2 Knowledge factors

"Factors related to the knowledge itself affect the efficiency of knowledge integration/creation" [Carro
Saavedra et al. 2015]. Similarly to what we did with the infrastructure factors, we grouped the 16 factors
and barriers into the following four groups: knowledge affinity, learning aptitude, knowledge breadth
and knowledge depth. Knowledge factors represent the characteristics of the transferred knowledge or
the characteristics of the relation between sender and receiver's knowledge. Knowledge affinity is the
degree to which the recipient possesses the required knowledge base so as to cover the missing elements
of the transferred knowledge [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015]; in other words, the similarity between the
transferred knowledge and the knowledge base of the recipient.
Maybe the most obvious example found in the literature is the language, which may restrict individuals absorbing knowledge effectively [Duan et al. 2010]. Learning aptitude refers to receivers’ competence to handle new learnings [Yih-Tong Sun and Scott 2005]. Knowledge breadth is sender’s ability to assess the relevance of knowledge across domains while knowledge depth is sender’s knowledge in one specific task [Majchrzak et al. 2013].

### 4.3 Psycho-social factors

According to [Carro Saavedra et al. 2015], psycho-social factors shape knowledge application because "applying or not the available knowledge is in the end a decision of the individual”. Psycho-social factors represent individual/environmental characteristics and perceptions that influence individuals’ behaviours. It is by far the category compiling the more factors (12) and the one in which the grouping was the most difficult; several aspects are still open for discussion. We identified 12 groups among the 77 factors and barriers collected from literature: perceived risk, perceived benefit, knowledge as power, commitment, trust, workload, personal relationships, culture, personality, social skills, mind openness, and past experiences. To classify and understand how these psycho-social factors influence knowledge application, we use the theory of planned behaviour [Ajzen 1991]. This theory says that individuals’ behaviours are influenced by a reasoned analysis of the outcomes and of the social pressure, and by the "perceived ease or difficulty of performing the behaviour". Perceived risk and benefit refer to the basic components of the reasoned analysis of the outcomes, the individual may perform the behaviour if the balance between risks and benefits tips toward the latter. The knowledge as power refers to considering the knowledge as a strategic asset used to gain or maintain a competitive position or advantage. Commitment refers to the quality of the dedication to a cause [Birch and Hooper 2012], in the case of the KM it may be the degree to which individuals are decided to apply knowledge in order to help the company getting competitive advantage. Trust is the "belief in the reliability, truth, or ability of someone or something" [Birch and Hooper 2012]; it is a context-specific factor of social interaction [Ferreira Peralta and Francisca Saldanha 2014]. Workload and personal relationships may also be contextual factors. Workload refers to the relation between the time required to complete the scheduled tasks in a certain time window and the duration of this time window. Personal relationships characterise the interaction among two or more people; for example, tie strength represents the frequency and the closeness of interaction among people [Granovetter 1985]. The next four factors, culture, personality, social skills, and mind openness, are not context specific factors and we will explain them using the categorization of the cultures made by [Hofstede 1991]. He made an analogy between people’s minds and computer programs (he worked in IBM). Within these mental programs, he established three levels: human nature, culture, and personality. Human nature refers to the parts of the mental code that all humans have in common. Because human nature is inherited and impossible to modify so as to influence people’s behaviours, we do not consider it. Personality, which is inherited and learned, represents the different mental programs of each individual person. Culture, distinguished from personality and human nature, refers to the behavioural characteristics that are common to a particular social group; it is not inherited but learnt through social interaction. Following [Hofstede 1991], we may consider that social skills and mind openness are characteristics of both personality and culture; in Hofstede’s words, social skills and mind openness may represent a part of the mental program code of an individual (personality).
or of a group of individuals (culture). In short, culture and personality, and social skills and mind openness may not be mutually exclusive. Finally, past experiences, formerly named in section 2 "new created knowledge", represent the WCM link between knowledge integration/creation and psychosocial factors. The knowledge individuals possess due to past decisions and experiences influence their behaviours. Maybe, comparing new created knowledge with past experiences may bring the the reader into confusion, which we do not intend. According to [Nonaka and von Krogh 2009], knowledge represents the capacity to act; besides, according to the WCM, every time individuals perform their behaviour they are creating new knowledge by means of combining the knowledge they already have (past experiences) with new insights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Benefit</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Social skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived relative advantage</td>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>Skills of communication and persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived expectation</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Articulability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Overruling objectives and hidden agenda</td>
<td>Transfer capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of performance appraisal</td>
<td>Team has other aspirations than knowledge transfer</td>
<td>Difficulty of concrete expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal acknowledgement</td>
<td>Team benefit maximisation vs organisational benefit maximisation</td>
<td>Lack of competence of staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Risk</th>
<th>Past Experiences</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived risk</td>
<td>Past experiences of conflicts that arose due to learning transfer</td>
<td>Knowledge-centered culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of reducing job security</td>
<td>Perceived irrelevance of the knowledge for future purposes</td>
<td>Organizational context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge as power</td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>Learning culture and teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is fear of “losing the edge”: The perceived power base</td>
<td>Prior relationships</td>
<td>Lack of sharing culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicion of whether other teams are sharing the knowledge in the same open way as we are doing</td>
<td>Not evidence-based</td>
<td>Culture and cultural characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition with others</td>
<td>Non-validated knowledge</td>
<td>Mind Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge may be perceived as a threat</td>
<td>Absence of negative past experiences linked to unit</td>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of loss of ownership and control of knowledge property and individual competitive edges/professional</td>
<td>Differences in experience levels</td>
<td>Favourable environment for questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal resistance (protect interests of organisation/business unit)</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of undermining position</td>
<td>Personality differences (lack of rapport within individual members)</td>
<td>Team confidence in the individual/acceptance of the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Different individual characteristics</td>
<td>Individual’s values are in variance with team values (e.g. trust, honesty, and integrity etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid that knowledge may be inadequate or unimpressive</td>
<td>Age differences</td>
<td>Can the individual be trusted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to gain acceptance into the team</td>
<td>Gender differences</td>
<td>Team value system (e.g. can the team be trusted?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the team by the organization</td>
<td>Differences in education levels</td>
<td>Info not perceived as reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team of recognition</td>
<td>Personal relationships</td>
<td>Fear of contamination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual management of time</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Accepting willingness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of slack times and heavy workload</td>
<td>Tie strength</td>
<td>Trustful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level of stress and fear of disadvantage/risk</td>
<td>Poor relationship between knowledge source and receiver</td>
<td>Mutual trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge cost</td>
<td>Lack of contact time and interaction</td>
<td>Doubt about whether the knowledge is updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of contact time and interaction between knowledge sources and recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>NIH syndrome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Factors of the category "psycho-social factors"**

### 4.4 Strategic factors

Strategy can be defined as "a set of actions that the managers take to increase their company’s performance relative to rivals" [Hill and Jones 2008]. In other words and with the WCM perspective, we can define strategy as the actions managers take to influence infrastructure, knowledge, and psychosocial factors. Within this category we found in the literature 23 factors and barriers we classified in two groups: strategic alignment and leadership. As already mentioned in section 4.1, the alignment of all factors is vital to increase knowledge application; this is what we define as strategic alignment, the degree to which the 21 factors should help the strategy implementation so as to increase knowledge application and competitive advantage. Leadership refers to the ability of leading people [Birch and Hooper 2012], leadership is the ability "to give an organization a sense of direction" [Hill and Jones 2008]. Therefore, for the WCM leadership could be seen as the ability managers possess to influence strategic alignment.
Figure 6. Factors of the category "strategic factors"

5. Conclusions

The Worker-Centered-Model (WCM) represents an attempt to understand a phenomenon that has been rarely studied (knowledge application), from a point of view that has been little considered despite its significance (individuals point of view). Within this paper, we extended the WCM by identifying the factors that influence the knowledge processes experienced by individuals working with knowledge. We realized a review of the factors influencing knowledge application from relevant literature in the field of knowledge management (KM). We collected 364 factors named by the authors of 31 journal papers. Then, we analysed and classified them into the 4 categories of the WCM, and later grouped reducing them to 21. Figure 7 shows paper main outcome.

Figure 7. Worker-Centered Model with the final influencing factors

This work contributes to the research community providing a summary of a large amount of hardly comparable research results aligned to one unique model. The initial 364 factors found in literature are summarized to 21. Furthermore, each factor is allocated influencing directly one knowledge process on
the WCM. This brings transparency to understand how factors influence knowledge application. The WCM can now be used as a base to develop new approaches to support knowledge application and understand to which factors new approaches contribute positively or negatively.

From practitioners' perspective the paper can be used as checklist to evaluate the current status of factors influencing knowledge application in the company. Based on this analysis, weaknesses or strengths in the company's knowledge processes can be identified. Then, the checklist can be used again to evaluate the impact of implementing measures to overcome the identified weaknesses on other influencing factors and the complete model can be used to estimate their consequences to knowledge application. Therefore, the model can work as a tool to supports the selection of appropriate measures. The extended WCM was briefly discussed with two industry experts; they quickly understood it and commented the following: "The model gives the impression that it is reduced to the required and therefore easy to understand. We believe that the acceptance of a model for KM is directly linked to its clarity."

One limitation of the work is the criteria for selecting the 31 papers with factors and barriers. We followed [Webster and Watson 2002], but we later had to set our own criteria to constrain the results to a manageable pool.

Other limitation is the subjectivity of the clustering and allocation of the factors. Paper authors discussed together the clustering and allocation according to the criteria they established for each individual factor of the initial 364 factors until achieving a consensus for the final results. However, the results are not validated in detail with researchers or practitioners that were not involved in the research process.

KM is a superordinate discipline that can be applied in the context of engineering design (ED). The factors presented in this paper are limited to the field of KM but it seems reasonable to assume that the factors influencing knowledge application obtained from KM are also the factors influencing knowledge application for ED. What we cannot say is which factors are more relevant in ED or if there is any factor to be added because of some special characteristic of knowledge management in ED.

6. Further work

In order to make the results generalizable, we will validate the clustering of the 21 final factors and their allocation to the Worker-Centered-Model (WCM) with industry experts. With the purpose of specifying the WCM for the field of engineering design (ED), we will also ask experts from ED industry to identify the relevant factors they see in the context of ED. We plan to fulfil both objectives within a survey for engineering designers.

We will also consider the possibility of realising a case study for one specific company to evaluate the current status of the 21 factors influencing knowledge application using them as a checklist.

As long-term objective, several ED companies can be analysed to derive the most common failure factors when applying knowledge and thus set the foundations to develop new approaches for knowledge application.
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