

KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN AN EMERGING NETWORK OF PRACTICE: THE ROLE OF A KNOWLEDGE PORTAL

Peter van Baalen, Jacqueline Bloemhof-Ruwaard, Eric van Heck

ERIM REPORT SERIES <i>RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT</i>	
ERIM Report Series reference number	ERS-2005-003-LIS
Publication	January 2005
Number of pages	33
Email address corresponding author	evanheck@rsm.nl
Address	Erasmus Research Institute of Management (ERIM) Rotterdam School of Management / Rotterdam School of Economics Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam P.O. Box 1738 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands Phone: +31 10 408 1182 Fax: +31 10 408 9640 Email: info@erim.eur.nl Internet: www.erim.eur.nl

Bibliographic data and classifications of all the ERIM reports are also available on the ERIM website:
www.erim.eur.nl

REPORT SERIES
RESEARCH IN MANAGEMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA AND CLASSIFICATIONS	
Abstract	This article addresses the emergence of networks of practice and the role of knowledge sharing via knowledge portals. Its focus is on factors that stimulate the successful emergence of networks of practice. Literature on knowledge management and communities of practice suggest the pre-existence of shared knowledge or a shared believe system as a condition sine qua non for the networks of practice to emerge. We challenge this assumption and argue and demonstrate that common knowledge and believe systems are rather a result of knowledge sharing instead of a pre-condition. The central question is how a knowledge portal facilitates the diffusion of knowledge among rather loosely coupled and often disconnected innovation projects. Research is carried out in the agricultural industry in the Netherlands. In this industry there is a need to change from a product-oriented to a problem-oriented innovation structure. The set up of a platform and knowledge portal around agro-logistics – crossing different product-oriented production clusters – was therefore a logical result. It gave the opportunity to analyze what the impact of a knowledge portal is in a situation that people and projects come from different organizations that do not know each other. Do they start to share knowledge and what are the conditions? With regard to the case study of the knowledge portal in the agricultural industry we conclude that a knowledge portal will have an impact on how projects are sharing knowledge and on the emergence of a network of practice. The results show that pre-conditions for the emergence of a network of practice are sense of urgency and fragmented awareness. These results also indicate the important role of a knowledge broker. The developed knowledge portal seems to lead to overcoming structural holes and a closer cognitive distance among the projects. However, we did not find a direct effect of the knowledge portal on sharing tacit knowledge. In the initial phase of a network of practice the knowledge exchange seems to focus on general, non-project specific and explicit knowledge. There was also no direct effect of the knowledge portal on the reciprocity of knowledge exchange among the projects. However, knowledge was shared between the project level and the platform and public level. Conclusions and directions for future research are formulated.
Library of Congress Classification (LCC) LCC Webpage	Mission: HF 5001-6182
	Programme: T 58.5-58.64
	Paper: HD 30.3 Communication of Information
Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) JEL Webpage	Mission: M
	Programme : L 15, O 32
	Paper: G 14 Information and Market Efficiency L 15 Information and Product Quality
Gemeenschappelijke Onderwerpsontsluiting (GOO)	
Classification GOO	Mission: 85.00
	Programme: 85.20
	Paper: 05.30 Massacommunicatiemiddelen
Keywords GOO	Mission: Bedrijfskunde / Bedrijfseconomie
	Programme: informatiemanagement
	Paper: Agro-industrie, portals, kennisoverdracht, sociale netwerken
Free keywords	Agro-logistics, Innovation Projects, Knowledge Portal, Knowledge Sharing, Network of Practice, Social Networks

Knowledge Sharing in an Emerging Network of Practice:

The Role of a Knowledge Portal

Peter van Baalen, RSM Erasmus University, Rotterdam

Jacqueline Bloemhof-Ruwaard, RSM Erasmus University, Rotterdam

Eric van Heck, RSM Erasmus University, Rotterdam

January 2005

ABSTRACT

This article addresses the emergence of networks of practice and the role of knowledge sharing via knowledge portals. Its focus is on factors that stimulate the successful emergence of networks of practice. Literature on knowledge management and communities of practice suggest the pre-existence of shared knowledge or a shared believe system as a condition sine qua non for the networks of practice to emerge. We challenge this assumption and argue and demonstrate that common knowledge and believe systems are rather a result of knowledge sharing instead of a pre-condition. The central question is how a knowledge portal facilitates the diffusion of knowledge among rather loosely coupled and often disconnected innovation projects. Research is carried out in the agricultural industry in the Netherlands. In this industry there is a need to change from a product-oriented to a problem-oriented innovation structure. The set up of a platform and knowledge portal around agro-logistics – crossing different product-oriented production clusters – was therefore a logical result. It gave the opportunity to analyze what the impact of a knowledge portal is in a situation that people and projects come

from different organizations that do not know each other. Do they start to share knowledge and what are the conditions? With regard to the case study of the knowledge portal in the agricultural industry we conclude that a knowledge portal will have an impact on how projects are sharing knowledge and on the emergence of a network of practice. The results show that pre-conditions for the emergence of a network of practice are sense of urgency and fragmented awareness. These results also indicate the important role of a knowledge broker. The developed knowledge portal seems to lead to overcoming structural holes and a closer cognitive distance among the projects. However, we did not find a direct effect of the knowledge portal on sharing tacit knowledge. In the initial phase of a network of practice the knowledge exchange seems to focus on general, non-project specific and explicit knowledge. There was also no direct effect of the knowledge portal on the reciprocity of knowledge exchange among the projects. However, knowledge was shared between the project level and the platform and public level. Conclusions and directions for future research are formulated.

(Keywords: Agro-logistics, Innovation Projects, Knowledge Portal, Knowledge Sharing, Network of Practice, Social Networks)

1. INTRODUCTION

The diffusion of innovative knowledge is considered to be as one of the main challenges in the emerging knowledge society. As this innovative knowledge is distributed and fragmented, internet-based information and communication technologies can help to leverage the knowledge diffusion. These technologies can easily connect distributed and loosely coupled 'pockets of innovation' and diffuse relevant information at high speed and at relatively low costs, see Tuomi (2002).

For this reason a platform of representatives of government, industry, and knowledge institutes in the Netherlands, the so-called *Platform Agro-logistics*, initiated the setting up of a knowledge portal in order to facilitate and speed up the diffusion of innovative knowledge in the agricultural industry. The set-up of this knowledge portal in the Dutch agricultural industry should be considered as an innovation itself. For many years this industry was characterized by a closed and hierarchical knowledge infrastructure in which the government dictated the research themes to the agricultural knowledge institutes. The research results were disseminated and communicated to the agricultural companies who were expected to apply this new knowledge in practice. But recent disasters such as the outbreak of animal diseases such as BSE showed the limits of this approach and new ways of innovations were explored.

In this paper we consider the diffusion of innovative knowledge as a form of collective action that requires social (collective) organization. It implies that the knowledge diffusion is viewed as an interactive process including the involvement of different collective actors.

The research question we address here is how a knowledge portal facilitates the diffusion of knowledge among rather loosely coupled and often disconnected innovation projects. Although the knowledge portal can easily connect these disconnected projects and thereby facilitate knowledge diffusion we will argue that a minimal social organization is needed to initiate this diffusion process. Literature on knowledge management and communities of practice suggest the pre-existence of shared knowledge or a shared believe system as a condition sine qua non for the networks of practice to

emerge, see for example Cohen and Levinthal (1990), Nonaka (1994), and Grant (1996). We challenge this assumption and argue and demonstrate that common knowledge and common believe systems are rather the result of knowledge sharing instead of a pre-condition. The aim of this article is twofold. The first objective is to conceptually describe the emergence of a network of people and groups that do not share knowledge and beliefs at the initial situation. The second objective is to empirically show how this network emerges and evolves and what factors contribute to the successful emergence. It implies that we do not assume the existence of a particular form of a social network (e.g. community of practice) in advance, but will view this as the outcome of network evolution.

Research was carried out in the agricultural industry in the Netherlands in particular the set up of innovation projects around themes related to agro-logistics, see Ministries of LNV and V&W (2001). Agro-logistics deals with the logistics e.g. transportation, storage, and distribution of agricultural products. The answer to the above question was sought in a case study approach. The case study provides a basis upon which theoretical propositions are formulated and generalized (so called analytic generalization), see Yin (2003). The choice of the case setting made it possible to analyze how a network emerges and how people and groups - that did not know each other - started to share knowledge. The case study let us closely track the design and use of a knowledge portal that could facilitate knowledge sharing among different innovation projects.

This article is divided into three main sections. First, a literature review of knowledge sharing in networks and the role of knowledge portals is developed into a conceptual framework, complemented with six propositions. Second, the empirical setting in the agricultural industry with research method and data will be explained. Third, an empirical analysis of the case of the knowledge portal in the agricultural industry will be presented. Lessons learned, conclusions, and suggestions for further research are formulated.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Knowledge Sharing

The diffusion of innovative knowledge has become one of the major research interests in management science and economics. A huge body of literature focuses on innovation as a “thing” about which information needs to be provided to potential adopters and users in order to implement this innovation successfully (Swan et al., 1999: 262). As knowledge has become to be seen as an innovation in itself new, critical questions arise how to define knowledge and how innovative knowledge can be diffused. Since the former question has been discussed extensively in the recent management literatures it suffices to discuss it briefly here. Since the publication of Nonaka’s seminal paper “A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation” the complex distinction between explicit and tacit knowledge has been widely accepted (Nonaka, 1994). The issue is not if there exists such a distinction but how to understand the complex relationship between explicit and tacit knowledge. Roughly, two different views can be distinguished in this debate: the ‘near tangible view’ and the distributed view on knowledge (Tsoukas, 2003). In the former view it is assumed that explicit and tacit knowledge can be converted to each other (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). This view suggests that knowledge, by means of articulation, can be called upon for use in reasoning and can be translated into language and other media (Winograd and Flores, 1986: 73). In the distributed view it is believed that tacit knowledge is a component of all knowledge and as such cannot be converted into explicit knowledge. Tacit knowledge is not internalised explicit knowledge, nor is explicit knowledge externalised tacit knowledge. In viewing ideas as objects that can be extracted from people and transmitted to other over a conduit, Nonaka and Takeuchi reduce practical knowledge to technical knowledge. According to Tsoukas (2003) tacit and explicit knowledge are complementary, in the sense that explicit knowledge is always grounded on a tacit component and vice versa. Tsoukas further criticizes the notion of knowledge as a given or something that is to be discovered. The organization is a distributed knowledge system and cannot be surveyed as a whole; it is lacking an “overseeing mind”. Similarly, Winograd and Flores argue that articulation of

the unspoken is a never-ending process, as we must do it in a language and a background that itself reflects a pre-understanding. “Knowledge”, as they put it, “ is always a result of the interpreter, which depends on the entire previous and on situatedness in a tradition (1986: 75). Thus knowledge has an important tacit component, which resides in individual skills, understanding, collaborative social arrangements, but also in tools, documents, and processes that embody aspects of knowledge (Wenger et al., 2002: 11). As these skills and social arrangements are related to work activities we will call them *practices* (Szulanski, 2003). This view contrasts the ‘near tangible view’ as it suggests that any form of explicit knowledge assumes the existence of tacit knowledge that cannot be articulated. As a consequence, the transfer of innovative knowledge from one practice to another will become problematic. Disembedding knowledge from one practice and re-embedding this knowledge into another practice does not go without any costs. Von Hippel has coined the concept of “stickiness” of knowledge to refer to the incremental costs to transfer knowledge from one practice to another (Von Hippel, 1994: 430, see also Szulanski, 2003). When transfer costs are low, knowledge stickiness is low; when it is high, knowledge stickiness is high. Both Von Hippel (1994) and Szulanski (2003) point to the fact that the stickiness of knowledge involves not only the complex epistemology of knowledge, but also attributes of the knowledge source, the knowledge recipient, and of the context. When the knowledge source and the knowledge recipient share the same context and are engaged in the same practice, the stickiness will be relatively low, whereas the transfer cost will increase when the knowledge source and the knowledge recipient operate in different contexts and are engaged in different practices.

Knowledge transfer within and between organisations is not a one-way activity, but a process of trial and error, feedback, and mutual adjustment of both the source and the recipient of knowledge (Von Krogh, 2003: 373). This mutuality in the knowledge transfer suggests that the process can be construed as a sequence of collective action in which the source and the recipient are involved (Von Krogh, 2003: 373). For this reason we will use the term *knowledge sharing*, instead of diffusion and transfer, as it succinctly

refers to the social processes that are involved. Sharing knowledge is not giving a full representative account of what is known by the source about a particular practice to the recipient. Because of the tacit component, knowledge contains an ineffable element; it is based on an act of personal insight that is essentially inarticulable. Tsoukas argues that this does not mean that we cannot share knowledge about a practice, but it should be viewed as re-punctuation of distinctions underlying the practice, as drawing attention to unnoticed aspects and as making people aware of new connections (Tsoukas, 2003). The stickiness of knowledge sharing does not only refer to the epistemological but also to the relational problems. According to Szulanski (2003) people on the source side may be reluctant to share their knowledge with others for fear of losing ownership, a position of privilege, superiority, for the lack of insufficient rewards, for lacking time to communicate about an innovative practice. Another reason can be that people are unaware of the fact that their knowledge might be of interest to others. On the recipient side important factors like the reluctance to accept new knowledge from an external source ('not invented here'-syndrome), the inability to exploit outside sources of knowledge (absorptive capacity), an inability to retain the new acquired knowledge in the organization, increase the stickiness of knowledge sharing.

2.2 Emergence of Networks of Practice

The sharing of knowledge requires social organization and governance. Traditional organizational forms (markets and hierarchies) show serious deficits in organizing the complex nature of knowledge (Jones et al., 1997). For this reason new organizational forms are introduced to deal effectively with the sharing of explicit and implicit knowledge. The community of practice concept, introduced by Lave and Wenger (1991) and transferred to management domain by Brown and Duguid (2000), represents probably one of the potentially most useful and enduring concepts in this respect. Most definitions of communities of practice (CoP) stress the importance of *shared* practice, repertoire, interests, knowledge, on informality, and on the self-organizing character of the community. Recently, Brown and Duguid (2000) have distinguished two types of networks, networks of practice (NoPs) and

communities of practice (CoPs). In the former people have practice and knowledge in common but are mostly unknown to each other. The links between the networks are mostly indirect (e.g. databases, newsletters, info bulletins) and members coordinate and communicate normally explicitly. NoPs can have an enormous reach. There is relatively little reciprocity across NoPs as the members do not interact directly to another. NoPs are loosely coupled systems that hardly initiate collective action and produce little knowledge.

CoPs on the other hand represent relatively tight-knit groups of people who know each other well and work together directly. Online communication is often supported by face-to-face interactions, which enable them to coordinate and communicate to a high degree on implicit knowledge. Due to these face-to-face relationships the communication reach is bounded. CoPs are characterized by strong reciprocity norms which help the community to sustain.

Although the distinction between CoPs and NoPs seems to be clear at the surface level, it is hard to determine precisely in advance if the social collective should be conceived as a CoP or a NoP. We suggest that both, CoP and NoP, are particular forms and therefore suggest to take the social network as the starting point for our analysis and conceive CoPs and NoPs as particular forms of social networks. A social network can be defined as a patterned organization of a collection of actors and their relationships (Jones et al., 1997). It is important to note that in this minimal definition no specifications are given about the nature of the actors and their relationships. According to Wellman and Gulia (1999) this implies that even when people are only connected through a computer network, they should be conceived as a social network. We don't agree with this minimal definition because if no interaction takes place one cannot speak of a social network. The collection of actors should contain more than two actors to be defined as a network. Triadic relationships differ fundamentally from dyadic relationships because in the former 1) individuality is reduced; 2) the individual power is reduced; 3) and conflicts are moderated by the presence of a third party. We can add to this definition two other characteristics (Podolny and Page, 1998). The first is that the collection of actors pursue repeated, *enduring exchange relations* with one another. If exchanges are not enduring but episodic - engaging in an

incidental transfer of goods, services or information - there is no social network but a market situation. The second is that social networks lack a *legitimate organizational authority* to arbitrate and resolve disputes that may arise during the exchange (as is the case in hierarchies). Based on these characteristics a network can be viewed as a social exchange structure with its own governance structure and patterns of interaction in which flows of resources between independent units (or individuals) take place.

Most research on social networks focus on existing social structures. Less attention is paid to the way these networks emerge and evolve. In their study of CoPs Wenger et al. (2002) made a first attempt to sketch the evolution of CoPs by identifying five stages of community development. According to the authors CoPs typically start as loose networks that hold the potential of becoming more connected and to develop towards a tightly-knit community. However, loosely connectedness presumes the existence of particular ties between the members of a potential network. This might make sense within the context of one organization or CoPs where homogeneity of interests and knowledge can be presumed. Our question, however, focuses on the emergence of those initial ties between actors that come from different organizations and who do not or hardly know each other. Many authors state that the coordination and sharing of knowledge cannot take place without assuming a vast amount of mutual knowledge, mutual beliefs, and mutual assumptions. This is what is called common ground. Similarly Grant (1996: 115) argues that common knowledge (language, other forms of symbolic communications, shared meanings, commonality of specialized knowledge etc.), defined as the intersection of individual knowledge sets, should be conceived as a precondition for the knowledge integration. Cohen and Levinthal (1990) point to the importance of overlapping knowledge in organizations in order to assimilate external knowledge, whereas Nonaka (1994) views redundancy of knowledge a necessary precondition for knowledge creation and the building of trust. Nooteboom (2000) has coined the concept of cognitive distance and cognitive proximity to refer to cognitive closeness and similarity between people. It does not only refer to the cognitive variety but also to the differences in abilities of perception, interpretation, and

different views on the world that develop out active interaction with the physical and social environment (Nooteboom, 2000). Cognitive distance yields both a problem and an opportunity (Nooteboom and Bogenrieder, 2003). When the cognitive distance is too short or is absent people share the same knowledge, there is no incentive to share knowledge. This might be the case when people interact frequently and consequently establish strong ties networks like CoPs. However when cognitive distances are too great, the more difficult it becomes to cross the distance, i.e. to mutually understand the actions and expression in the network. The notion of cognitive distance is relevant here as succinctly points to the potential of a network to emerge. The question however is still how much cognitive similarity is needed to initiate knowledge sharing. In order to find out what is minimally needed to initiate enduring interaction we briefly discuss Weick's (1979) theory on the emergence of collective structure. Weick (1979) argues that people initially don't have to agree on goals to act collectively. In any potential collective, people have different interests, preferences etc. and want to accomplish different things. In order to achieve these ends they have to initiate action towards others by which they create mutual commitment (interlocked behaviours) to collectively pursue diverse ends through common means. Once people are engaged in mutual commitments a subtle shift takes place from divers to common ends. As Weick argues, diverse ends remain, but they become subordinated to an emerging set of shared ends. This part of Weick's evolutionary theory contrasts conventional thinking about the preconditions for the emergence of collective structures. The second part of Weick's theory addresses the question how coordination can take place even though ties between people are minimal. To this end he discusses the notion of mutual equivalence structure (MES). The MES is like an implicit contract between people that can be built and sustained without knowing the motives of another, and without people having to share goals. Weick points to three preconditions for an MES to emerge. The first is that a person must perceive that his ability to perform his consummatory act depends on the instrumental act of the other. The second is that a person must perceive that his own instrumental act serves to elicit the instrumental act of the other. Third, a MES only emerges when a person repeats his instrumental act. A fourth

precondition can be added, that is that a person must have some knowledge (expectations) about another person that can fulfil his instrumental acts. From this perspective we may conclude that the common ground, needed to initiate a MES, does not refer to common knowledge or a common believe system but from a mutual expectation structure.

The issue of reciprocity in online networks is widely debated among researchers. Especially the motivation for people to contribute to an online connected group of people who do not or hardly know each other have been subject to extensive research. Wellman and Gulia (1999) point to different types of explanations. The first refers to the fact that online contributions are a means of expressing one's identity. Helping others might increase self-esteem, reputation, respect from others etc. The second one is generalized reciprocity and organizational citizenship. In their recent research on three online communities McLure Wasko and Faraj (2000) concluded that sharing knowledge and helping others is 'the right thing to do' and that people also have a desire to advance the community as a whole. Participants did not expect to be reciprocated by the same person with whom he shared knowledge (direct exchange) but did expect to receive future help by someone in the network. Wellman and Gulia (1999) argue that the logistic and social costs involved in online contribution are relatively low. The easy access to online social networks allows and enables people to contribute at low participation costs. Discussing the economies of online cooperation Kollock (1999) points to the limitations of online cooperation and collective action. Although it is quite easy to produce and share digital information, it requires coordinated activities from the beginning. Another weakness is that active knowledge producers withdraw from the online network, the network will stop to exist. The basic features for an online network are: ongoing interaction, identity persistence, and knowledge of the previous interactions. (Kollock, 1999: 235). The notion of online generalized exchange demonstrates how fragile the minimal social situation of emergent social network is.

2.3 Design of Knowledge Portals

The question then is how the design and the management of an interactive information and communication system should look like for the online (generalized) exchange of knowledge in a minimal social situation. The agro-logic projects are geographically dispersed and the participants hardly know each other and have rarely communicated. In the literature three dominant perspectives on the role of information and communication technologies on knowledge sharing are distinguished: deterministic view on technology, medium choice theory, emergent process perspective. We believe that the three perspectives are not mutually exclusive. It is now widely accepted that user involvement is essential in the process of design and implementation. However the user is just one node in the potential network of knowledge sharing. It is not only important to know if user A prefers to use a particular application of the intranet for the transfer of a particular type of knowledge but also if person B and C have similar preferences and expectations. The implication of our argument here is that the design of an interactive information system should not reflect the needs of individual users but the social structure (triadic relationships) of the emerging network. We therefore call for a *relational* and *rich* information systems design. That design will have the following three characteristics:

- It should be relational as it should not only address the needs of individual users but also the triadic expectations of a potential social network. It means that in the initial stage of the development of the knowledge portal the potential network actors should be informed about these expectations (e.g. by organizing meetings, providing information about the projects, advertising, see Damsgaard, 2002).
- It should also be rich as it is impossible to predict how the actors in the network will communicate. Social networks are complex social systems that cannot be simply founded. They develop and transform over time (Wenger et al., 2002). To allow the online social network to take different shapes and to evolve in different directions the design of the knowledge portal should dynamically match different social profiles of the network. It implies that the knowledge portal should provide

different spaces of knowledge sharing, synchronous and asynchronous communications media, document storage and retrieval etc.

- Perhaps the most important requirement for the design in the minimal social situation is that people converge on the *means*, in our case the knowledge portal. Following Weick's theory on the emergence of collective structures we consider the knowledge portal as a *means* to facilitate the sharing of knowledge between different groups.

Markus et al. (2002) argue that traditional information system design theories are badly equipped to deal with emergent knowledge processes (EKPs'). EKP's are defined as organizational activity patterns that exhibit three characteristics in combination: deliberations with no best structure or sequence; highly unpredictable potential users and work contexts; and information requirements that include general, specific, and tacit knowledge distributed across experts and non-experts. We believe that the set up of a knowledge portal in agro-logistics in order to facilitate the diffusion of knowledge between the distributed projects fits pretty well the situation as described by Markus et al. (2002). However, the portal is only the 'front door' of an intranet or an extranet (Chaffey and Wood, 2004). Intranets and extranets are called decentralized, general purpose- and open-ended technologies which mean they can be designed for different purposes and can potentially be constructed and modified by those who are involved in the design and use of these information systems (Damsgaard, 2002).

2.4 Conceptual Framework

The following conceptual framework depicts the role and impact of knowledge portals and how networks of practice emerge, see Figure 1. Based on the literature review we formulate the following propositions:

As discussed by Brown and Duguid (2000) in networks of practice people have practice and knowledge in common but are mostly unknown to each other. The links between the networks are mostly indirect (e.g. databases, newsletters, info bulletins) and members coordinate and communicate are normally explicit. There are two factors that seem to be a pre-condition for the

emergence of networks of practice: sense of urgency and fragmented awareness.

Proposition 1: A higher sense of urgency to tackle specific problems of practice will lead to the emergence of a network of practice.

People are tackling specific problems of practice and one way to do that is to coordinate and communicate. However, there has to be a high sense of urgency that people will coordinate and communicate with people they hardly know (and also from other organizations). Without that level of urgency “out of the box” thinking seems not a strategy people will follow.

Proposition 2: Fragmented awareness in a dispersed industry will lead to the emergence of a network of practice

A second pre-condition is that there has to be a fragmented awareness in a dispersed industry. People need to have the expectation that somewhere out solutions are available. They know that they don’t know and they know that somebody else might know (about similar problems and potential solutions). Without that fragmented awareness there seems to be no logical reason to strengthen ties among people.

Next to these two basic factors we think there are more specific factors that stimulate or hamper the emergence of Networks of Practice (NoPs). The following factors will be taken into account: action by broker, role structural holes, type of knowledge, and type of knowledge sharing.




Figure 1: The conceptual framework

Proposition 3: An active knowledge broker will lead to the development of a knowledge portal and the emergence of a network of practice

The links in a network are mostly indirect. Therefore in the initial phase there has to be an active broker bringing people together who do not know each other before. Previous research has shown that an active broker (in a coordinated or spontaneous way) helps to create the indirect linkages among members of an emerging network. The role of a knowledge broker is identified by, for example, Davenport and Prusak (1998).

Proposition 4: A knowledge portal will bridge between structural holes and will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

Potential knowledge portals have the ability to create direct linkages (between the portal and the knowledge sender/receiver) in such a way that direct linkages between the sender and receiver are not necessary. In such a case structural holes are overcome (Burt, 1992). As we have seen there is a paradox in such a way that overcoming structural holes indeed will lead to effective knowledge exchange because as Nooteboom and Bogenrieder (2003) indicated cognitive distance yields both a problem and an opportunity.

It is still unclear how much cognitive similarity is needed to initiate knowledge sharing.

Proposition 5: A knowledge portal will lead to the exchange of project-domain knowledge and therefore will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

A knowledge portal will make it easier and less costly to transfer and exchange knowledge. However, as we have seen that related to the stickiness of knowledge both Von Hippel (1994) and Szulanski (2003) indicate that the transfer cost will increase when the knowledge source and the knowledge recipient operate in different contexts and are engaged in different practices.

Proposition 6: A knowledge portal will lead to reciprocity in knowledge sharing and therefore will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

As Kollock (1999) argues, the generalized exchange system of sharing is both more generous and riskier. It is more generous because the person who gives provides the network with a benefit without the expectation of immediate return. However generalized exchange is also more risky because actors are easily tempted to free ride (taking without contributing). However, the basic features for an online network are: ongoing interaction, identity persistence, and knowledge of the previous interactions. (Kollock, 1999: 235). Therefore a knowledge portal has to lead to a certain level of reciprocity in knowledge sharing to continue the emergence of a network of practice.

3. RESEARCH METHODS AND DATA

3.1 Case Study Background

The role and impact of knowledge portals for the emergence of networks of practice will be validated by a case study of a knowledge portal for agro-logic innovation projects in the Netherlands. For a detailed description of

case study research, see Yin (2003). Agro-logistics deals with the transport, storage, and distribution of the agricultural flows of food and non-food goods in the entire supply chain. Agro-logistics is an important sector. In the Netherlands, more than 20% of good transportation (including import and export) includes agro products. The agribusiness has recently dealt with a number of bottlenecks such as animal diseases leading to trade embargos, congestion at the Dutch highways, international competition, and stronger legislation regarding food safety and animal well-being. Recently, a number of developments in the society have taken place, influencing the management of agro-logistic flows. These developments are: higher consumer awareness, pull strategy (market) instead of push strategy (producers), fragmentation, scaling-up in retail and agro-distribution, globalisation and liberalisation, sustainable entrepreneurship, sharpened legislation, and more attention for tracing and food safety.

The agricultural community has a product-related cluster structure. This can be illustrated by the names of the Product Boards (regulatory organizations for businesses in the agricultural supply chains): Animal Feed, Beer and Wine, Cattle, Meat and Eggs, Dairy, Farming, Grains and Seeds, Horticulture. These sectors are highly independent of each other with very weak ties between each other. They often are called the Pillars of Agriculture. Within these pillars, knowledge is available and people have regular contacts with each other. Between the pillars, the information sharing and communication is quite low. The recent developments and bottlenecks urged the community to change from a product-related structure towards a problem-related structure. These problems occur in the area of spatial planning, EU legislation, high scale infrastructure, and optimizing logistic networks. In order to develop a vision on the sustainable coherent future of the agro-logistics sector, a platform of representatives of government, industry, and knowledge institutes arose, the so-called Platform Agro-logistics (Ministries of LNV and V&W, 2001). The *Vision Agro-logistics* aims to reach a sustainable, innovating and transport-efficient sector and is based on three keywords, i.e. Clustering, Binding, and Directing. The national government, cooperating with the Platform, invited the sector to propose innovative projects in the area of agro-logistics to improve the sustainable development. The innovative character

can be converted to Clustering (realisation of large scale agribusiness areas), Binding (innovative logistical concepts) and Directing (towards virtual livestock markets or worldwide plant cultivation networks). The Platform Agro-logistics focuses on coordinating between parties, tuning with governmental organizations, and creating support. The goals of the platform are (i) to advice, cooperate and coach the pilot projects in the accomplishment of system innovations and (ii) to attract attention and share information on the threats and opportunities in the agro-logistics sector. In 2003, 20 innovative pilot projects were selected by the Dutch government to be supported in their development by the Platform Agro-logistics. The project proposals came from almost all pillars in the agricultural industry like vegetable products, chicken, plant cultivation, cheese, and pig farming. The innovations are not essentially product based, but had to fit in the themes of Clustering, Binding, and Directing.

3.2 Knowledge Portal: Stages and Data

It is important that knowledge on how to innovate and the innovation itself will be exchanged in an efficient and effective way among the projects and towards potential new projects. The Platform Agro-logistics suggested to set up a (virtual) place to meet each other, to share information and knowledge, to deal with governmental and policy issues, and to seek for financial resources, in other words, to be a network of practice. A knowledge portal, a platform based on internet-technology, can support the forming of a network or community. The knowledge portal should open the door to innovative knowledge in the various pilot projects, regardless time, place, and existing relations of knowledge exchange.

The development of the knowledge portal was executed in three stages. In the *first* stage (March 2003 – June 2003) the objectives, requirements, and design rules were determined. Structured interviews were held with all project leaders of the different innovation projects, see Van Baalen et al. (2003). The aim of these interviews was to answer the following questions:

- Do the selected innovative projects have a need for a knowledge portal?

- Is there a need for specific knowledge and information (both in content as in type of knowledge/information)?
- Is there a willingness to share?
- If there is a need, what is the main design of the portal, and what are critical success factors for the design, building, and implementation of the knowledge portal?

The interview results showed that there was a high sense of urgency to tackle specific problems of practice exists. About 80% of the project leaders showed a need to exchange knowledge by means of a knowledge portal. The knowledge portal was also seen as a effective medium to reach the public in general, creating a basis for the innovative projects, making the projects known to the public, and finding new partners. The interviews also show that the knowledge and information need is very diverse between the projects. Some groups have the same type of questions. It is peculiar that these groups are not divided by the central Platform themes Clustering, Binding and Directing, neither by the pillars of the Agro Sector. The Projects can be divided as follows:

- *Entrepreneurs* that want to share knowledge with respect to legislation, best practices, subsidiaries, and lobbying;
- *Knowledge institutes* with no need for a social knowledge network, interested in European subsidiaries;
- *Umbrella projects* with a need for sharing knowledge in the field of project management and regional scaling-up.

All interviewees showed a high willingness to share information with each other and with the public space. With respect to the design of the knowledge portal, a layered structure was suggested in such a way that it reflects the current community structure, i.e. a project level, a platform level, and a public level. Each level gives entrance to specific types of information. Being present in the public space was one of the priorities of the project leaders (visibility).

In the *second* stage (July 2003 – August 2003) the knowledge portal was designed, built, and tested. It was decided to structure the knowledge portal into three levels. The first level deals with the innovation projects, the second level with the platform level, the third level with the public space. At the project

level knowledge sharing among the members of the project is facilitated. The members of a project share a common practice in which knowledge primary related to the project is developed and shared. Relations are direct and tightly coupled and implicit knowledge sharing (learning by doing) possible. At the platform level knowledge can be shared among the different projects and the members of the Platform Agro-logistics. The platform level is only accessible by the members of the different projects and the platform. The knowledge exchange at this level is worthwhile for the community as a whole, as it gives a base for sharing experiences and best practices among the sectors and therefore from moving from a product-related innovation structure towards a problem-related structure. Finally, at the public level knowledge can be exchanged between the innovation projects and the actors outside (public, innovation projects outside agro-logistics, other industries). Here information is available for everybody and free of charge.

In the *third* stage (September 2003 – until now) the knowledge portal was used. A web master was taking care of the functioning the portal and for the instruction of the users. In that period we were able to monitor the use of the knowledge portal and therefore we could analyze who was using the knowledge portal and how it was used. The use of the knowledge portal in the first year (September 2003 – August 2004) will be presented in this article. Detailed statistics were available about the profile of the visitors, the amount of hits and page views, and details about the visitor sessions. A visit is defined as a hit originating from the same IP-address with a maximum time between the hits of 20 minutes. A monitoring tool was developed and linked to a social network analysis software program called UCINET 5 (Borgatti et al. 2004). With the help of this program a general analysis of relationships among the projects in the emerging network of practice could be identified. For a more thorough explanation of the used research methods and techniques, we refer to Van Baalen et al. (2003).

4. ANALYSIS OF EMPIRICAL DATA

4.1 Knowledge Portal Statistics

The knowledge portal (www.agrologistiek.nl) went alive in September 2003. For one year, we analyzed the knowledge portal statistics. In one year the total number of hits was about 275,000 hits. The results indicate after a period of intense visiting the knowledge portal had between 15,000 and 20,000 hits per month in the period December 2003 – May 2004. In the summer of 2004 the amount of hits increased. Figure 2 shows the monthly number of unique visitors of the knowledge portal.




Figure 2. Overview of the number of visitors since the start of the knowledge portal

The data of the number of visitors show that there is steadily an increase of visitors due to the fact that the public is more aware about the existence of the knowledge portal. The total number of visitors to public level vary from 218 in the first month to 571 one year later. Figure 2 shows that the number of visitors grows steadily over the year, with two exceptions: the second month (October) has a relative high number of visitors, caused by the novelty of the site and the month May has a relative low number of visitors, probably due to the Spring holidays. The number of visits during the year suggest that there is a need for information sharing within and from outside the agricultural community.

In one year more than 7,500 documents were downloaded. Table 1 presents the top 10 of downloaded files. Original titles of the documents were in Dutch.

	Document	Number of downloads
1	Brochure_Platform_Agro-logistics.pdf	2786
2	Agro-Logistic Invitation Letter.pdf	1252
3	Finalreport_Agro-chains and Clusters.pdf	960
4	Agro-logistics_ Examples.MPG	697
5	Pre-announcement_Agro-logistics.pdf	600
6	Vision_Agro-Logistics.pdf (Platform)	514
7	Bundling of Agro-streams.pdf (Clustering)	476
8	Conference_registration_Aro-logistics.pdf (Platform)	465
9	Letter_MinistersLNVandVenWto Second Chamber.pdf (Platform)	316
10	Examples Agri-parcs.pdf (Clustering)	278

Table 1: Top 10 of downloaded files from September 2003 till September 2004.

From this list, we can conclude that the need for information focuses on the existence of the Platform Agro-logistics and its vision (1,6,8,9), and less on the content and urgency of the innovative projects. Only one of the themes of the Platform Agro-logistics is in the top 10, namely Clustering logistics flows in Agribusiness centers (3,7,10).

Apart from a statistical analysis of the Public level, it was possible to monitor the communication between the projects themselves, at the Platform and Project level. Some functionalities were hardly or not used. For example, the discussion forum was hardly ever used. Also the use of the bulletin board was negligible. These features were pointed out as potential useful features in the interviews. The feature of sharing information by downloading documents was frequently used, as indicated by Table 1. For each downloaded document, data was available with respect to the supplier of the document (providing information) and the client (receiving information). Table 2 provides information on who shared documents with whom. In Table 2 the providers are represented in the rows (between brackets the number of posted documents), the columns represent the receivers. Providers and receivers are innovation projects. In total there were 25 innovation projects indicated by P01, P02, ..., P23, P26, and P27. P24 and P25 were projects for general and project management purposes. Not all projects come back in Table 2 due to

the fact that these projects were stopped or merged with other projects. The values in the matrix represent the number of times that, for example, project 01 downloads information from project 02 in the Platform or Project space. These spaces were restricted to members only and can be visited through a login name and a password.

Supply	Demand														
	P01	P02	P03	P04	P11	P12	P13	P15	P17	P20	P21	P23	P25	P26	P27
P01(12)	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P02(5)	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
P03(9)	1	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0
P04(7)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	3	0	0
P11(14)	9	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
P12(10)	4	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	18	0	0
P13(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
P15(9)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0
P17(11)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	2	0	0
P20(45)	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	559	0	0	2	0	0
P21(9)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	2	0	0
P23(1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0
P25(6)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	141	0	0
P26(5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	21	0	0
P27(5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2: Document sharing among the projects in the Knowledge Portal

Table 2 shows mixed results: some projects were active providers of documents, some projects were active consumers of documents, and some projects were not very active at all in sharing documents. A more detailed analysis of knowledge sharing among projects will be discussed in the next section.

4.2 Lessons learned

Based on the interviews of the project leaders, the design and use of the knowledge portal, the knowledge portal statistics, and the monitoring of the document exchange among the projects the proposition - as defined in section 2 - were validated. A network of practice will emerge if there is a sense of urgency (Proposition 1) and fragmented awareness in a dispersed

community (Proposition 2). Proposition 3 states that active action of a broker will lead to the development of a knowledge portal. The broker in this case is the Platform Agro-logistics. For testing Proposition 4, 5 and 6, we carried out interviews with all innovative pilot projects (Van Baalen et al., 2003) and analyzed for one year (September 2003 – August 2004) the actual use of the knowledge portal. The purpose of the interviews is to find data on the network situation before the start of the knowledge portal (Proposition 4, Structural Holes), to investigate the need for knowledge and the type of knowledge needed (Proposition 5, Types of knowledge), and the willingness to share knowledge (Proposition 6, Reciprocity in knowledge sharing). The analysis provides the following lessons learned.

Proposition 1: A higher sense of urgency to tackle specific problems of practice will lead to the emergence of a network of practice.

In the former people have practice and knowledge in common but are mostly unknown to each other. The links between the networks are mostly indirect (e.g. databases, newsletters, info bulletins) and members coordinate and communicate are normally explicit. NoPs can have an enormous reach. There is relatively little reciprocity across NoPs as the members do not interact directly to another. NoPs are loosely coupled systems that hardly initiate collective action and produce little knowledge.

The Agro-logistics case shows that there was on one side a high sense of urgency in the agricultural sector to start the Platform Agro-logistics. Several reasons were mentioned during the initial phase of the set up of the platform. These reasons were related to the outbreak of animal diseases, transportation problems, and more strict legislation for food safety. Also during the interviews with the project leaders at the start it turned out that most of these project leaders indicated an urgent need for collective action with regard to transport and distribution problems related to agro-products in the Netherlands. On the other hand in analyzing objectives, incentives, and the lack of direct subsidies for projects to participate there was not a level of high urgency. Projects could not be pushed to deliver results in a fast way, subsidies were not directly

given to projects, the platform was installed to facilitate the different innovation projects. Overall, there was a shared level of urgency to innovative to keep the competitive position of the Netherlands in the field of agro-logistics. Proposition 1 is accepted.

Proposition 2: Fragmented awareness in a dispersed industry will lead to the emergence of a network of practice

The Agro-logistics case shows that there was a fragmented awareness in a dispersed agricultural industry. Traditionally, the agricultural community is structured in a product-oriented way (meat, milk & cheese, flowers, fruit & vegetables). Agro-logistical problems and solutions are running through these different product units. Therefore there was a need for agro-logistical experts to learn from innovations in different product-oriented communities. In these different communities there was awareness that the agro-logistics community is highly dispersed and the lack of coordinated action was hampering the solutions related to agro-logistical problems. Proposition 2 is accepted.

Proposition 3: An active knowledge broker will lead to the development of a knowledge portal and the emergence of a network of practice

The set up of the Platform Agro-logistics including representatives of different stakeholders in the different product-related communities together with representatives of local and national authorities started to act as a broker in an emerging network of practice. Especially the chairman and secretary of the platform acted as active brokers – they took the initiative to develop a knowledge portal. In the initial phase of the knowledge portal most documents and initiatives were posted by the web master. Proposition 3 is accepted.

Proposition 4: A knowledge portal will bridge between structural holes and will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

To look at the impact of the knowledge portal in overcoming structural holes and decreasing the cognitive distance among projects it was analyzed which projects know each other before the platform and knowledge portal was

implemented. The different project leaders were interviewed and were asked if they knew the other projects (Van Baalen et al., 2003). Based on these interview results the relationships among the different projects were measured and drawn with the help of UCINET software (Borgatti et al., 2004). In the left part of Figure 3 the initial network is sketched. As one can see there are seven projects that have no relationship with other projects and some projects have very weak ties with the other projects. None of the projects exchanged regularly information and knowledge. After one year of using the knowledge portal it was analyzed which documents were exchanged among the different projects. The right side of Figure 3 presents the network after the introduction and use of the knowledge portal. As Figure 3 indicates that projects are exchanging documents and therefore might learn from each other. One can see that a network of practice is emerging. The knowledge portal overcome some structural holes and there are indications that the cognitive distances among the actors are not too short e.g. that there is no incentive to share knowledge. Proposition 4 is accepted.




Figure 3: Information exchange among projects before (left part) the introduction and one year after (right part) the introduction of the knowledge portal.

Proposition 5: A knowledge portal will lead to the exchange of project-domain knowledge and therefore will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

We distinguish three types of knowledge:

- Type I – This type of knowledge is project-domain knowledge and developed by one of the innovation projects
- Type II – This type of knowledge is platform-domain knowledge and developed by one of the innovation projects
- Type III – This type of knowledge is public-domain knowledge and developed by one of the innovation projects

As discussed the knowledge portal was developed with three levels or spaces: project, platform and public. By analyzing the use of the knowledge portal (documents, web pages, bulletin board) we conclude that information exchange among the different projects (Type I) was rather limited. The analysis also shows that some documents were exchanged at the platform level (Type II) and most documents were exchanged at the public level (Type III). There seems to be two potential explanations. The first one relates to the stickiness of knowledge – see Von Hippel (1994) and Szulanski (2003). The different innovation projects did not exchange because the transfer costs were too high due to the fact that the knowledge source and the knowledge recipient operate in different contexts and are engaged in different practices. The decreased transfer costs of the knowledge portal did not overcome the high level of transfer costs related to the stickiness of the knowledge. The second one relates to the concept of cognitive distance – see Nooteboom and Bogenrieder (2003). The cognitive distance among the innovation projects seems to be too high and therefore it is more difficult to cross the distance among the projects. It seems to be logical that at the emergence of a network of practice knowledge exchange will start with knowledge with low transaction costs and a low cognitive distance (such as general project knowledge). The analysis also indicates that there is information exchange *within* some of the projects. This can be considered as a new type of knowledge (knowledge

exchange within project). Especially large projects (with around 50 project members) were eager to exchange information within the project. Proposition 5 is not accepted. However, the empirical results indicate a *revised* Proposition 5: In the initial phase of a network of practice the knowledge exchange will be focused on general, non-project specific and explicit knowledge. It is expected that after this phase the exchange will be directed to project-specific and tacit knowledge.

Proposition 6: A knowledge portal will lead to reciprocity in knowledge sharing and therefore will contribute to the emergence of a network of practice

Reciprocity in a network means that projects are posting and demanding knowledge to other projects. This is different from market relationships where a specific activity (an indication to buy something) will automatically lead to an offer by the other party. In a network of practice one can post knowledge but one does not automatically and directly get something in return. However, in the longer term one expect that if one posts a question to the network – better to say to one of members (in our case projects) – that it will react with an offer. We analyzed the knowledge exchange among the projects and distinguished four type of projects. These four types are labeled:

- Individualistic Projects: These projects do not post and have no demand of information and knowledge.
- Altruistic Projects: These type of projects post a lot, but have no demand.
- Free rider Projects: These projects show no posting, but demand a lot.
- Reciprocity Projects: These project do posting and demanding.

Interesting is to analyze how projects developed during the use of the knowledge portal. Figure 4 identifies the typology of the projects after one year of using the knowledge portal based on the document exchanges via the knowledge portal.




Figure 4: Reciprocity in knowledge sharing among projects after one year of using the knowledge portal.

Figure 4 indicates there is not much reciprocity with regard to explicit innovative knowledge sharing among the projects. The empirical analysis shows that there is high reciprocity related to two projects (P01, P20). There is one project (P025) – which is not one of the core innovation projects but a cooperation project among the project leaders of the innovation projects that has a free rider characteristic. In general, there was no free rider behavior among the innovation projects. The question remains if - giving the objectives of the knowledge portal e.g. exchanging innovative knowledge – the knowledge portal stimulated the exchange of knowledge. Given the empirical results the answer is that there was no direct and strong relationship between the impact of the knowledge portal on reciprocity of knowledge sharing. Proposition 6 is not accepted. Several explanations could be given for this result. The first one is that the innovation projects started with a long cognitive distance among the projects. Therefore it is not easy to develop mutual understanding and trust. The second explanation is that reciprocity is not executed via the knowledge portal but via other channels (direct contact, telephone). A third potential explanation is that level of urgency – although indicated as high at the start of the platform – to share knowledge projects was not that high. It seems that there was a high urgency within the projects

to execute the projects (deliver at deadlines, secure financial resources, link to relevant partners), but a lower urgency to help directly other projects. The empirical results show the notion as argues by Kollock (1999) that the generalized exchange system of sharing is both more generous and riskier. It is more generous because the person who gives provides the network with a benefit without the expectation of immediate return. However generalized exchange is also more risky because actors are easily tempted to free ride (taking without contributing). For this reason the generalized exchange has the structure of a social dilemma in which individually reasonable behavior might lead to collective disaster (Kollock, 1999). In our case there was no free-rider behavior among the projects, but also no balanced knowledge supply and demand. In the longer term there is the potential risk that the knowledge portal runs dry and that the network of practice will dissolve.

5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Research Problem

The central research question of this article is how a knowledge portal facilitates the diffusion of knowledge among rather loosely coupled and often disconnected innovation projects. With regard to the case study of the knowledge portal in the agricultural industry we conclude that a knowledge portal will have an impact on how projects share knowledge and on the emergence of a network of practice. The results show that pre-conditions for the emergence of a network of practice are sense of urgency and fragmented awareness. The results also indicate the important role of a knowledge broker. The developed knowledge portal seems to lead to overcoming structural holes and a closer cognitive distance among the projects. However, we did not find a direct effect of the knowledge portal on sharing tacit knowledge. In the initial phase of a network of practice the knowledge exchange seems to focus on general, non-project specific and explicit knowledge. There was also no direct effect of the knowledge portal on the reciprocity of knowledge exchange among the projects. However, knowledge was shared between the project level and the platform and public level.

This paper makes three key contributions to the literature of knowledge management, networks of practice, and innovation policy. These are the key messages of this article that managers need to be aware of. First, it identifies critical factors in explaining how networks of practice emerge. It is one of the first studies that focus at a situation where people and projects from different organizations that do not know each other started to share knowledge and use a knowledge portal. It shows that even in this type of situations networks of practice can emerge. Second, it provides a conceptual framework that would like to explain the critical factors for the development of common knowledge and the emergence of networks of practice. We think that the typology of types of knowledge related to project, platform, and public will be useful in the design of future knowledge portals. Also the typology of projects in terms of supply and demand of knowledge is a useful tool to analyze (potential) reciprocity in knowledge exchange relationships. Third, it provides a detailed analysis of the emergence of a network of practice around agro-logistical innovation projects in the Netherlands.

This study has some limitations and the results need to be interpreted with care. These limitations are:

- The use of the knowledge portal could not be isolated from other knowledge exchanges among the projects. Telephone contact and physical meetings also stimulated to share information and knowledge and this impact is not taken into account
- There was no detailed analysis done on the impact of shared documents on the practice of the receiving project. Did it lead to active use of the gathered knowledge?
- The knowledge portal is analyzed before and after one year of use. The period might be too short to see a sustainable effect and impact.

5.2 Suggestions for Further Research

There could be made several suggestions for further research on the impact of knowledge portal on the emergence of networks of practice.

First, in this research propositions have been suggested. These propositions need to be refined into hypotheses and need to be tested. This could be realized by performing a large-scale research of knowledge portals. As a result it could be possible to make statements, based on statistics, about whether the proposed hypotheses are valid or not.

Secondly, further research is envisaged in the area of a more detailed analysis of the effect of knowledge portals. In this article the focus of the analysis was around the document exchange as a first indicator of knowledge exchange. A more refined analysis could shed light on the use and impact of knowledge portals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research in this article is executed in the KLICT project Kennisportal Agrologistiek HR-185. We would like to thank the Platform Agrologistiek for their support during this research project and we thank Mathijs van der Vlis for his assistance in analyzing the data.

REFERENCES

- Baalen van, P., J. Bloemhof, E. van Heck, P. van de Veire. 2003, *Analyse kennisportal Agrologistiek* (in Dutch), report Erasmus University Rotterdam, 40 pp.
- Borgatti, S., M. Everett and L. Freeman. 2004. *UCINET 5 for Windows: User's Guide*. Harvard: Analytic Technologies, 7 June 2004
- Brown, J. S. and P. Duguid., 2000. *The Social Life of Information*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Burt, R. S. 1992. *Structural Holes. The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.
- Chaffey, D. and S. Wood. 2004. *Business Information Management. Improving Performance Using Information Systems*. Essex: Prentice-Hall.
- Cohen, W. M. and D. A. Levinthal. 1990. Absorptive Capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128-152.
- Damsgaard, J. 2002. Managing an Internet Portal. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 9: 408-420.
- Davenport, T.H. and L. Prusak. 1998. *Working knowledge. How organizations manage what they know*. Boston MA, Harvard Business School Press.
- Grant, R. M. 1996. Toward a Knowledge-Based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(winter special issue): 109-122.
- Hippel von, E. 1994. "Sticky Information and the Locus of Problem Solving: Implications for Innovation. *Management Science*, 40(4): 429-439.

- Jones, C., W.S. Hesterly, and S.P. Borgatti. 1997. A general theory of network governance: exchange conditions and social mechanisms. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(4): 911-945.
- Kollock, P. 1999. The economics of online cooperation: gifts and public goods in cyberspace. In M. A. Smit and P. Kollock, (Ed.), *Communities in Cyberspace*: 220-239. London etc.: Routledge.
- Krogh von, G. 2003. Knowledge Sharing and the Communal Resource. In M. Easterby-Smith and M. Lyles, A. (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*: 372-392. Malden, Oxford, Melbourne, Berlin: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lave, J. and E. Wenger, 1991. *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, M. L., A. Majchrzak, and L. Gasser. 2002. A Design Theory for Systems that Support Emergent Knowledge Processes. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(3): 179-210.
- McLure Wasko, M. and S. Faraj, 2000. "It is what one does": why people participate and help others in electronic communities of practice. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 9: 155-173.
- Ministries of LNV and V&W. 2001. *Visie Agrologistiek: Clusteren, Verbinden, Regisseren* (in Dutch), Rapport aan de Tweede Kamer, Den Haag, 30 p., 14 november 2001. (www.agrologistiek.nl)
- Nonaka, I. 1994. A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1): 14-37.
- Nonaka, I., Takeuchi, H. 1995. *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Nooteboom, B. 2000. Learning by interaction, absorptive capacity, cognitive distance, and governance. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 4: 69-92.
- Nooteboom, B. and I. Bogenrieder. 2003. *Change of Routines: a Multi-Level Analysis*, Rotterdam: ERIM report, (www.irim.nl)
- Podolny, J. M. and K. L. Page. 1998. Network forms of Organization. *Annual Review Sociology*, 24: 57-76.
- Swan, J., S. Newell, H. Scarbrough, and D. Hislop. 1999. Knowledge management and innovation: networks and networking. In: *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 3, Nr. 4, pp. 262-275.
- Szulanski, G. 2003. *Sticky Knowledge. Barriers to knowing in the firm*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Tuomi, I. 2002. *Networks of Innovation. Change and Meaning in the Age of the Internet*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Tsoukas, H. 2003. Do we really understand tacit knowledge? In M. Easterby-Smith, and M. Lyles (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*: 410-427. Malden etc.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Weick, K. 1979. *The Social Psychology of Organizing* (second edition ed.). New York: New York.
- Wellman, B. and M. Gulia. 1999. Virtual communities as communities: Net surfers don't ride alone. In M. A. Smith and P. Kollock (Eds.), *Communities in Cyberspace*: 167-194. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wenger, E., R. McDermott, and W.M. Snyder. 2002. *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Winograd, F. and F. Flores. 1986. *Understanding Computers and Cognition: A new Foundation for Design*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Yin, R.K., 2003, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Thousand Oaks, Sage, Third Edition.

Publications in the Report Series Research* in Management

ERIM Research Program: "Business Processes, Logistics and Information Systems"

2005

On The Design Of Artificial Stock Markets

Katalin Boer, Arie De Bruin And Uzay Kaymak

ERS-2005-001-LIS

<http://hdl.handle.net/1765/1882>

Knowledge sharing in an Emerging Network of Practice: The Role of a Knowledge Portal

Peter van Baalen, Jacqueline Bloemhof-Ruwaard, Eric van Heck

ERS-2005-003-LIS

A note on the paper Fractional Programming with convex quadratic forms and functions by H.P.Benson

J.B.G.Frenk

ERS-2005-004-LIS

A note on the dual of an unconstrained (generalized) geometric programming problem

J.B.G.Frenk and G.J.Still

ERS-2005-006-LIS

* A complete overview of the ERIM Report Series Research in Management:

<https://ep.eur.nl/handle/1765/1>

ERIM Research Programs:

LIS Business Processes, Logistics and Information Systems

ORG Organizing for Performance

MKT Marketing

F&A Finance and Accounting

STR Strategy and Entrepreneurship