

[Lucia Garcia-Lorenzo](#)

Networking in organizations: developing a social practice perspective for innovation and knowledge sharing in emerging work contexts

Article (Accepted version) (Refereed)

Original citation:

Garcia-Lorenzo, Lucia (2006) *Networking in organizations: developing a social practice perspective for innovation and knowledge sharing in emerging work contexts*. [World futures: the journal of general evolution](#), 62 (3). pp. 171-192. ISSN 0260-4027

DOI: [10.1080/02604020500509520](https://doi.org/10.1080/02604020500509520)

© 2006 [Taylor and Francis Group](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/16057/>

Available in LSE Research Online: January 2014

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

World Futures Journal, Special Issue on Complexity & Innovation

Networking in organisations:

Developing a social practice perspective for innovation and knowledge sharing in emergent work contexts.

Lucia Garcia-Lorenzo

Social Psychology Institute,
London School of Economics,
Houghton Street,
London WC2A 2AE, U.K.
Tel: +44 (0)20 7955 7996
L.Garcia@lse.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper focuses on the micro-level phenomena related to emergent ways of organising. It explores the use and development of social networks within a multinational business organisation –the Corporation- and reflects on their impact on the processes of organising and knowledge sharing. In particular, the paper looks at the ways of organising that emerged within the Corporation after the set up of an internet business unit aimed at generating and spinning off new internet related businesses.

Considering knowledge as a dynamic and emergent process -rather than as an attribute of the organisation- means stressing its intrinsically social nature. Knowledge as conceptualised in the paper, is generated, shared and transformed through participation in social interactions. It is also through the membership to different networks that individuals are able to transcend the organisation and its boundaries and connect and relate to other organisations and the wider environment. That is why the focus of the paper is on the process of networking as a social practice rather than on the structure or mathematical properties of the resulting networks themselves.

This perspective on networking and knowledge leads to a conceptualisation of organisations that stresses their inherent complexity and their interactive and co-evolving nature with their environments.

Keywords: Knowledge spaces, new ways of organising, networking, multinational corporations.

1. Introduction.

The current intensified business competition, rate of technological change, and the pace of globalisation processes are radically transforming organisational life. In trying to address these challenges, organisations are developing new working practices that shape and are shaped by the way people relate to each other within and across organisations. Indeed, within the new economy, working practices have become increasingly ‘networking practices’ (Wittel, 2001). This focus on networks is

not knew¹, almost a decade ago Castells' (1996) work already outlined the global macro-society of the information age naming it the 'network society'. In his work, he describes these networks as open structures able to expand without limits and highly dynamic. Networks are 'appropriate instruments for a capitalist economy based on innovation, globalisation and decentralised concentration' and also for a 'culture of endless deconstruction and reconstruction' (Castells 1996: 470).

In management, the growth of the social network discipline has been aided by three important developments in the business world (Newel et al. 2002): the importance of the informal structure within the organisation, that coexists with the formal structure. Even in the most bureaucratic organisations, individuals have always interacted with each other in a myriad of ways not specific to the organisational chart. Second, the shift in the 20th century to an organisational model that is flatter, more flexible, team oriented and more reliant on knowledge assets. With this shift to more organic, network like structures, has come a need to understand how these structures work and how to manage them. And third, the rapid growth in close co-operative relationships across organisational boundaries –outsourcing, joint ventures, alliances, multi-organisational project work etc. Also virtual organising generates a host of new management issues about how to manage work in the absence of strict reporting relationships.

Whereas the structure of the traditional industrial sectors is represented to a large extent by physicality and materiality -through products machinery, plants, transport and delivery systems- (Kallinikos 2001); nowadays bureaucratic models of organisation still exist, but the different ways of organising emerging are more fluid and dynamic than traditional structures (Newel et al. 2002). As Kallinikos (2004:6) says "network [has become the] counter image of organisation to the boundary maintaining, hierarchically structured systems underlying the industrial age." This helps to explain why "network" has become 'the' conceptual tool to identify flows of information and resources through formal or informal organizations and institutions, particularly significant in economic and social terms when uncertainty is high.

¹ "Network" as a concept that has been increasingly used throughout the last two decades in social sciences. Moreover, the theoretical study and applications of "network analysis" are also the focus of an enormous amount of specialized works from Sociology, Anthropology, Economic Theory, etc. (Burt, 2000)

The metaphor of a network has become a very suggestive image of organising in an age of high context-crossing electronic transactivity. There are however a number of problems with the use of the concept in organisational settings (Conway, Jones and Steward, 2000). The studies focused on organisational networks have an excessive emphasis on the utilitarian and functional value of the network itself. As a result there is very little data gathering in relation to the actors and relationships within the network and a lack of focus on its dynamics –if anything there is a rather excessive reliance of the ‘whom to whom’ relationships – (Burt, 2000; Granovetter, 1974). In most cases, the network’s structure is supposed to be stable even if the membership of the network changes. Furthermore, the demarcation of the network boundaries in/across organisations is also problematic. It is important therefore to differentiate between "network" and "organisation". A "network" goes usually way beyond institutions and organizations (either firms, commercial houses, banks or hospitals). Furthermore, as Kallinikos (2004) suggests, compared with traditional forms of organising and markets: ‘network’ as used in organisational studies emerges as nearly devoid of institutional anchoring and social implications. It is not that clear from those studies how the concept of a network can challenge, complement or replace traditional organisational forms.

Studies dealing with the concept of social capital (some quotes like Putnam,) have tackled some of these problems when it comes to networking as social practice. Bourdieu (1986) who originated the notion of social capital, has consistently answered the reproduction of more traditional social relations. However, how crucial is social capital in the new informational are that involve not the reproduction but rather the production of social relations ? The transformations of the system of economic production also alter traditional social structures (Touraine, 1988). The development of this different ways of relating are linked to the development of ICTs, to the process of globalisation and individualisation and to the fact that modern society is society on the move (Lash and Urry, 1994: 252). If we focus then, on the process of networking as an emergent social practice rather than on the structure or mathematical properties of the resulting networks themselves we might begging to understand why networking, which has always been an important business practice, seems to be broadening as a phenomena and acquiring such importance especially when it comes to create or disseminate knowledge in geographically disperse organisations. It is to this area of research that this paper aims to contribute.

The paper is organised as follows. In the following section current research in organisational knowledge is briefly reviewed and some its characteristics are highlighted. Section two focuses on the particular role organisational collectives such as networks play in processes of organisational knowledge whereas section four presents the details of the research methodology and introduces an overview of the case study. This is followed by a description and analysis of the main narrative. The final section draws some conclusions regarding a networking approach to studying knowledge processes in organisations.

Organisational knowledge as participation

Any collective engaged in work practices is able to create a space where knowledge is generated, maintained and transmitted. And yet, research about knowledge in organisational networks is generally limited by normative expectations on how people 'should behave' to be successful networkers, whereas knowledge processes are often explored only in relation to their degree of manageability.

Indeed, within the organisational literature the idea of managing knowledge has been developed and/or challenged according to a number of different perspectives very much in line with current debates in social sciences (Brown and Duguid, 2001; Alavi and Leidner, 2001; Alvesson and Karreman, 2001; Schultze, 1998). I would distinguish mainly two polar positions: 'having' knowledge and 'enabling' knowledge (Smircich, 1983; Cook and Brown, 1999). Whereas in the first perspective knowledge is seen as an attribute or possession of the organisation or of its individual members – 'knowledge workers' – the second perspective looks at knowledge from a more systemic point of view, as a dynamic generative and emergent process. I explore this distinction below.

Treating knowledge as an attribute of the organisation takes us back to a functional perspective on organisations conceptualising them as machines (Morgan, 1986). Researchers following this approach, tend to portray knowledge as part of the structural system of the organisation and therefore attuned to, and supportive of it. They take for granted that the organisation 'has' knowledge and that in exploiting it, it will become the firm's main source of 'competitive advantage' (Holsapple and Joshi, 2002). Thus, knowledge is thought as objective, divisible¹, and therefore manageable – at least in its explicit form- using technology as the set of tools to codify it (Hansen et

al. 1999). The social phenomena underlying the generation and sharing of knowledge are considered as factual, measurable and delimited and therefore perceived as behaving in a functional or dysfunctional way in terms of achieving the organisation's survival.

This has consequences for the way knowledge is treated and explored. It is implied that an ineffective organisation can be made effective and enhance its profit margin if an 'unhealthy' knowledge system can be supplanted by a 'healthy' one (Thomas et al. 2001). Following this approach organizations have attempted to find a way through which they can make the knowledge emanating from the individual's personal experiences part of the organization's knowledge databases in order to enhance the firm's 'competitive advantage'. However if knowledge is an "ambiguous, unspecific and dynamic phenomenon, intrinsically related to meaning, understanding and process and thus difficult to manage" (Alvesson and Karreman, 2001) it would make more sense to think in terms of facilitating knowledge transfer and reproduction rather than in managing it (Tsoukas, 1996).

Understanding organizational knowledge as an object or resource tends to privilege explicit over tacit knowledge, and knowledge possessed by individuals over that possessed by the group (Cook and Brown, 1999). However, what we 'know' and the way we practise it emerges from the interplay between tacit and explicit knowledge -it is inter-subjective-, and is therefore inherently indeterminate and continually emerging (Tsoukas, 1996). Furthermore knowledge needs also a language to be transmitted, represented and shared and as such is always historically and culturally specific. The knowledge -and therefore the sense of 'reality' - that is shared by particular social groups, is sustained by social processes.

From this perspective individual experiences are not considered in isolation, since knowledge is the product of interaction and communication (Tsoukas and Vladimirou, 2001). Indeed, for experiences and explanations to be thought of as relevant knowledge, they have to be experienced as meaningful by the social collective. Thus, it is social groups that determine what is 'memorable' and also how it will be practised. It is to this idea of 'knowledge-as-participation' (Brown, 2002, in Bouwen and Craps, 2004) that I want to draw attention to in this paper.

This perspective takes a conceptual shift away from the individual towards the group, from possessions towards processes, and the focus is on interactions and social practices. Considering the sharing of knowledge in social collectives as relational

implies to focus our attention on the conversations and joint practices that the network members constantly engage in. Since organisational practices cannot operate outside the cultural or discursive level and depend upon meaning for their effective operation, “it is apparent that they can and should be seen as discursive practices.” (du Gay 2000: 166).

Organisational collectives seen in discursive terms have been described as either ‘monologues or dialogues’ (Keenoy et al 1997: 149). The former indicates an organisation represented as one story told mainly by a dominant group that interprets the exchanges among its members as a coherent whole producing a singular narrative (Boje 1994). In contrast a ‘dialogical’ analysis recognises the different interpretations of any given organisational story and treats them as co-existing discourses that might overlap at some point throughout their interpretation of the reality of the organisation. This type of analysis stresses the constant negotiation of differences that is enacted through socially constructed practices. The organisational collective, can then be seen as through an unfolding conversation.

Among organisational collectives dialogues imply tension, and articulation of meanings through the centripetal forces seeking expression in unity, merging and monologue and the centrifugal forces seeking expression in multiplicity, separating, disagreement and dialogue. The centripetal forces pushing towards unity and order account for the dominance of particular narratives whereas the centrifugal forces of multiplicity and diversity seek to be given more room to be expressed within that narrative. Hence, through everyday conversational activity people aim to organise their collective experiences but are also able to generate new strategies and innovate.

Placing actions and social practices at the centre of attention means also that neither individuals nor systems are allowed to predominate but that the analysis can concentrate on the actions and manifest organisational practices displayed in the interaction between both (Wenger, 2000; Brown and Duguid, 2001). The organisation’s advantage would then be more related to efforts of co-ordination and enabling –rather than managing– the knowledge processes occurring among different collectives within and around the organisation (Brown and Duguid, 2001; Newell et al., 2001).

From networks to networking as a social practice

Most of the studies of knowledge explored before follow what Morgan would call the machine metaphor for understanding organisations (Morgan, 1986). It is the most common metaphor in organisational literature and although it has been criticised and recognized as unsatisfactory in a rapidly changing world; it has nonetheless continued to inform the practice of management. The image of an organisation as a machine relies on the deployment of prescribed rules and formalised control intended to simplify the operations of the organisation to achieve predictability even in conditions of uncertainty and change. That is why the metaphor continues to be very attractive, since it seems to offer simplification, routine and predictability as well as rationality as the means to understand the process of organising and also the interchange of knowledge. Even if there is an agreement about the complex world that is the business world these days and about its constantly changing environment, this metaphor still dominates the way we think and act in relation to organisations (Morgan, 1986). In a sense formal organisation emerges as a way of 'managing and reducing' its complexity.

However, organisations are inherently complex. From a knowledge point of view, this perspective on organisations emphasises how connections among members of a network can enable learning and development (Griffin et al. 1998; Kallinikos, 1998; Anderson, 1999; Kauffmann, 2000). As a system organisations are able to gather data about their surroundings, themselves and their behaviour and then use that information for guiding future actions (Kauffman, 2000). However, the connections established among different parts of the network allow not only for information transmission among collectives but also open up possibilities of generating and sharing new meanings, thus providing increased capability to share and generate knowledge. If we think in terms of organisational collectives and their working relationships this also means that people are able to organise themselves and the knowledge they share by relying in their web of connections when they need to search and acquire new information or reorganise their activities. The benefit of this perspective is the conceptualisation of the organisation as a structure that is fluid, yet sensitive to the needs of the connected elements as well as in connection with its environment in such a way that co-evolution –of both the organisation and its environment- is possible (Griffin et al., 1998).

Indeed, most contemporary organisations are networks of interdependent units, using 'groups' and work teams as their 'building blocks'. For that reason relationships among the different components of the organisation –individuals or groups- are complex being characterised by a mixture of co-operation and competition. People compete against each other for power and scarce resources but, in the meantime they need to rely on each other in order to accomplish their tasks, while emotional ties are formed among them (Masterbroek, 1987). Owing to the necessary interdependency among organisational units, the process of organising needs to take place through the fine balancing of co-operation and mutual dependency on the one hand, and rivalry and autonomy on the other hand. This is reflected in the need that work teams experience to create a common framework of working routines and habits in order for people to work together and at the same time to capitalise on and encourage difference and variety –e.g. specific expertise- that would allow for both innovation and creativity within the team and the wider organisation.

However, most of the research work done in relation to networks still revolves around the idea of increasing the network's –and eventually the organisation's- performance (Burt, 2000 –books on networking). In fact, despite the importance given to networking in the organisational literature there are few studies which aim to look at networking *per se* –looking at practices and processes- and even less tracking the social processes involved (Hosking and Morley, 1991).

The exception to this rule are the studies dealing with social capital with their emphasis on community and interactions among the members of a community that use their networks as capital, as social capital –*brief explanation and summary*- And yet these studies do not explain why relationships have become more fragmented. Andreas Wittel (2001) introduced the concept of network sociality as a contrast to the term community. Community he argues entails 'stability, coherence, embeddedness and belonging' (pg. 51). Any community involves strong ties, proximity and a common history or narrative of the collective. Network sociality on the other hand, does not represent belonging but rather the processes of integration and disintegration. It is a disembodied subjectivity that is somehow lifted out of a specific geographical context. It is the social expression of what Bauman calls the 'liquid modernity'. In this sociality relationships are not 'narrational' but informational, not based on mutual experience or a shared common history but primarily on an exchange of data or on 'catching up'. Narratives are characterised by duration, whereas information here is

defined by ephemerality. This is what Sennet (1998) calls the erosion of enduring relationships in the world of work.

The social relationships among the members of working networks, -especially in geographically disperse organisations- are fleeting and transient yet iterative. The social bond at work is not bureaucratic but rather informational, since it is generally created on a project-by-project basis by the movement of ideas, the establishment of only ever temporary standards and protocols, the creation and protection of proprietary information. It is constructed on the grounds of communication and transport technology. Network sociality in this respect emerges alongside and sometimes displaces the idea of a community.

Within organisations, we see a replacement of linear time by serial time that leads to loss of trust between working colleagues, loss of commitment towards the task in hand, and generally of loyalty towards the organisation. Skills become portable and experience loses value. Projects are short term, short contracts, flexible tasks and increasing staff turn over make it difficult for employees to develop a common narrative anymore (Sennet, 1998). Detachment with the organisation and the project at hand is required, not involvement.

There is a constant individualisation of work that presumes a removal from historically prescribed social forms and commitments, a loss of traditional security with respect to rituals, guiding norms and practical knowledge (Beck, 1999). Instead individuals must actively construct social bonds. Schulze describes a change from pre-given relationships to choice. This choice in relations is defined by a higher degree of mobility, by translocal communications, by a high amount of social contacts, and by a subjective management of the networks. Tourane (1988) talked about how identity depends increasingly on an awareness of the relationships with others. People are lifted out of their contexts and reinserted in largely disembodied social relations, which they must at the same time continually construct, sociality is at the same time distanced and immediate.

Knowledge workers tend to be nomadic in their personal biography and their non-linear work biographies. Freelancers, more and more people work with and for firms but not for firms. Paradigmatic for the work situation, freelancers suffer from chronic network construction and maintenance, they are the most fully reliant on their own resources of social capital. There is an active construction and reconstruction of a social network. One has to constantly renew, refresh and reevaluate the existing

contacts. They cannot be taken for granted anymore.

Network sociality is a technological sociality insofar as it is deeply embedded in communication technology, transport technology and technologies to manage relationships. Transportation and ICTs provide the infrastructure for people and societies on the move. A community oriented sociality does not rely so much on that type of technology. Network sociality is de-localised, it is a sociality on the move, a sociality over distance. In the contemporary workplace the idea of uninterrupted face-to-face sociality, disentangled from technological devices is becoming a myth. We are experiencing an integration of long-distance communication in our realm of face-to-face interaction. It clearly indicates a process towards an integration of technologically mediated communication into our routines of face-to-face interactionⁱⁱ.

Information according to Lash (2002) is compressed in time and space. It takes no claim to universality but is contained in the immediacy of the particular. Information shrinks or compresses metanarratives to a mere point, a signal, a mere event in time. Network sociality mirrors this distinction between the narrative and information on a micro-sociological level. Network sociality is not rooted on a shared history. Loss of a shared biography, subjects cannot rely on a common narrative on a shared experience. Mobility and speed seem to be the primary reasons for this shift from a narrative to an informational sociality. Mobility is important because more and more people are on the move and thus somewhere else. In order to re-establish social contacts, catching-up becomes indispensable condition in social situations. Narratives are time consuming: information is quick. E.g. half hour business meeting especially over the telephone they have to be focused, exchange information, not stories, discourse or narratives.

Relationships are increasingly organised in terms of short term projects. As soon as a new project begins, talk becomes very intense, information moves to and for very quickly at the same time as its wider circulation is tightly guarded. For the duration of the project people work long hours and give the project priority. When the project terminates these collaborations are kept on a low flame and new projects cooperations and social ties are established or reestablished. Ephemeral but intense, focused, fast and overloaded social ties is also observable in nonwork situations - speeddating- .

According to Wittel (2001) there is an increasing perception of social

relationships as social capital. There is also a move from having relationships to doing and managing relationships. This way of relation implies social bonds that are being continuously produced, reproduced and consumed.

Howard Rheingold (1994) talked about the need for rebuilding community in the face of American's loss of a sense of community. ICTs according to him gives us the chance of revitalise communities. What has been lost because of mobility and a growing relevance of consumption can now be reconstructed with a little help from the monitor and the keyboard, a monitor, a process and a modem. His aim was to revitalise the public sphere and built new forms of community. However, this techno-deterministic perspective does not interlink cultural and technological change. The assumption that a cultural process –disentanglement from communities can be reversed with technology is relatively naïve. The use of the term community in relation to electronic communications is at least problematic and confusing. Communities share a common geographical territory, a common history, a common value system, and they are rooted in a common religion. Online communities however draw on the idea of the imaginary communities the Anderson talked about. The term virtual suggest a doubling of reality and it is not. On line and off line worlds are not separated they form part of the same reality. It suggests a reality that is not mediated. All on line experiences are very real experiences for people doing them. The main difference between on line and off line communication lacks a common and mutual perception of the context. Online sociality cannot rely on exogenous or contextual forms of structuration. Thus any structuration of sociality has to be produced internally by the participants.

As a contrast Sennet (1998) is perhaps the best known commentator on the erosion of enduring relationships. His question is show people can generate meaning and identity under conditions of increasing flexibility and risk? Maintain trusting and long lasting relationships and a permanent narrative in the work environment that worships change and condemns routine?

Flexibility is one of the characteristics of this short-term economy. Produces tolerance of fragmentation and generates lack of attachment. Networking seems to become more important than the ability to stick to a problem and resolve it. Flexibility also affects the loyalty to the company. And it affects also skills and experience. Skills become portable and experience loses value. The ability to focus quickly in news tasks counts more than accumulated experience. Change becomes a value in

itself and resistance towards change is taken as a sign of failure. Short term projects, contrast, flexible tasks and increasing staff turn over make it difficult for employees to develop a common narrative anymore. Detachment is required, not involvement. A good team player should have the ability to stand back from established relationships. This is the contrast to the utopian version of the online communities (Knorr-Cetina, 2000). Both communities and organisations are social systems with clear boundaries with a highly defined inside and outside. Networks however are open social systems.

Recent perspectives that have focused on the role of the organisational network in the generation and use of knowledge follow this approach when they suggest that although the integration of individual knowledge at the collective level is necessary, the knowledge is 'owned' nevertheless at the individual level (Okhuysen and Eisenhardt, 2002).

It is through the connection between the members of a network and their interchanges that stories, experiences and knowledge, are developed, maintained, interrupted and transformed. The way the communications flow among the members of a working network becomes crucial to develop new ways of organising and is the way in which knowledge is generated and shared among them. Organisational collectives therefore play a central role in the 'knowledge-creating company' (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995) because they provide a shared context where individuals can interact with each other and engage in the constant conversations on which effective reflection depends. If we take this view, we will be able to stress the interactive and co-evolving- nature of organisations with their environments as well as the process of co-emergence of both knowledge and organised structure through the "connection, interaction, [and] relationships between diverse entities" in the organisation (Allen, 2001).

Methodology

In this paper we consider knowledge as a social construction that is mainly constituted through dialogue, conflicting interpretations and action possibilities negotiated among the members of a collective. We have therefore used a research methodology that allows us to focus upon the shared social context of the parties involved in those knowledge processes. The research described in this paper has

followed a qualitative approach to data gathering and analysis. This approach implies essentially an emphasis on processes and meanings rather than on an examination or measurement in terms of quantity, amount, intensity or frequency (Van Maanen, 1982).

The particular Corporation where this study took place is a multinational business made up of more than 1800 individual companies with branches all over the world. It is a well known 'traditional organisation' with mainly two lines of 'core products'. However, two years ago, the Corporation put in place plans for leveraging its brand name and encouraging internal development. It set up a new internet business (NIB) in order to create new ventures in a non-traditional medium using "the internet as a way to look at new ways of doing business and creating new relationships, particularly online relationships with the customers... looking at ways we can do more with the brand, the customer contact and the actual points of sale." The business venture we have looked at more closely -as an example of the type of ventures developed by NIB- had participants in two continents and three different locations: London in the UK and Bombay and Delhi in India. The team observed was involved in the planning and implementation of an e-learning project with six schools in India.

As means of data gathering, we have conducted 10 semi-structured interviews with a cross-section of NIB members, together with a 'reflecting back' workshop. Each interview lasted at least 1 and ½ hour. The first author also attended 4 teleconferences with the India venture team. These were 'virtual observations' of the venture team weekly meetings -via teleconference-. All interviews and group discussions were taped and transcribed verbatim. The use of different methods of data gathering corresponds with the attempt to use different viewpoints to gain a greater understanding of the phenomena being studied adding rigor, breadth and depth to our investigation (Flick, 1992). The different methods can also facilitate and legitimate the diverse chorus of voices, interests and perspectives that exist within an organisation. Thus, using an interpretative approach and different methods of data gathering implies also looking into the multiple narratives that give voice to, and allow the construction of multiple organisational worlds (Alvesson, 1995).

In the following section, we present the analysis of the data from which the employees' stories have been extracted. Those stories were gathered through the in-depth interviews, group discussions and the meetings with employees of NIB. They

are one of the main forms of discourse through which organisational members share and transmit their experiences and therefore their knowledge. The analysis of those stories sought to identify the work processes the team from NIB engaged in while working on the development and implementation of ventures like the school e-learning project in India. The analysis consisted of multiple readings of the meeting and interview transcripts and documentation for the systematic identification of ways of relating, work processes and events. These were initially coded according to three main areas: i) the connections and communication processes –including enabling and inhibiting conditions- between NIB and the large corporation, ii) between the India venture team and NIB and iii) within the India venture team. The coding was achieved with the aid of Atlas/Ti, a qualitative research software for data analysis and management (Murh, 1997).

The next section aims to reconstruct the history and main concerns of NIB's employees according to those stories. The end result is an 'added story' that results from our analysis and seeks to 'make more complex' the reader's understanding of the stories employees have been telling to each other and to us during the research process. The aim of this account is to make clearer how those stories, and therefore experiences and knowledge, are (re) produced through the employees' interactions.

Networking constraints

NIB and the Corporation: Developing a two way relationship

The idea that new business prosper when separated from their corporate parents has become commonplace (Kluge et al., 2001). Separation is the model of choice especially when the old and the new differ greatly -for example the internet start up launched by an industrial company. But although the new businesses need space to develop, separation can prevent them from obtaining invaluable knowledge, experience and resources as well as rob the parent company from the vitality and new practices the new business can generate (Day, Mang, Ritcher, & Roberts, 2001). That was a tension experienced in the way of relating between NIB and the Corporation from the very beginning. NIB's main objective was to 'make money out of the internet' establishing their own niche while providing value back to the Corporation.

“We have, on the one hand, a corporate role which is that we need to relate back into the Corporation, given they are funding us and we’re part of them. We need to have a rapport and credibility there but at the same time we may need to have some attributes for the market place which are slightly different.” (Interview 2)

Being a new medium, the set of skills and capabilities the employees working at NIB needed were different from those required by the more traditional businesses within Corporation. That is why NIB started to look for people with ‘*the right set of capabilities*’ to compete and ‘*open up*’ new markets. People from *outside* the Corporation with the required skills were recruited. That soon created a perception of difference between the new employees in terms of origins: people coming from outside the company and people being promoted from within the Corporation .

“I think, it’s a good thing to have these specialists from outside and they bring a new perspective of what we’re trying to do, because here we’re trying to move into new businesses and I think they will help at least provide some input and insight as to what should be the benchmarks and having that benchmark of what we’re trying to do in the new environment will maybe help transform some of [the Corporation’s] processes and adapt them to be more effective and efficient. But equally from the [Corporation’s] side they need to understand that we’re moving into a new environment and you need those people...” (Interview 8)

At the same time, this recruiting of new people -some of them to very senior positions- meant usually reorganisation of roles and responsibilities. One of the problems associated with this reorganising of people and functions was the lack of time to distribute the necessary information for people to know “who does what, where and in what role”.

“...restructuring that takes place every six months. So, your reference indicator changes and you get constantly mapped into different parts of the organisation and even though, what you do every day doesn’t change, you just haven’t got a clue who’s doing what, who’s roles and responsibility, what its direction.” (Interview 6)

This lack of clarity was also echoed on they way people defined themselves: as employees of the Corporation or employees of NIB? This identification was important when it came to plan a career. Could they develop their career across the Corporation crossing over the specialisation that some of the jobs at NIB implied or were they employed to be NIB employees exclusively? This had practical consequences on the way the company hired its people creating temporary contracts when it came to fulfil some jobs or permanent contracts for some others.

"People who've transferred from [the Corporation] into NIB often regard this as a post within their greater career within [the Corporation]. So they regard themselves as perhaps a Corporation's employee first and they're very interested in knowing what is my status within the wider organisation, when is my promotion going to happen, when can I apply for my next position within [the Corporation]? People who come from outside might regard it as an internet business and see this as a step on their career in an internet world." (Interview 6)

According to Day et al. (2001) a company that seeks both performance and growth should give entrepreneurial activities plenty of space but also connect them to its parents' resources, goals and knowledge. However some of the characteristics of both the Corporation and the new business were inhibiting this 'linking back' process. For instance, the different ways of working and cultures necessary to carry on a new job:

"...the Corporation culture is, in some ways, a barrier to our culture" (Interview 2)

"we have a set of very [Corporate] industry...specific processes and they do not necessarily apply to very fast pace, internet venture set up and I'm experiencing problems in trying to move things forward and yet I've felt I'm being held back by these very heavyweight processes, which don't necessarily fit for a typical venture set up environment." (Interview 2)

An enabler *and* inhibitor for NIB's development was the way the Corporation is run: through informal networks. People tend to know each other and there seems to be little need for a formal organisational chart. The assumption is that everyone is or should be part of a network to be able to communicate and to do a good job. As many other enterprises, the Corporation organises itself around 'projects' coordinated through those networks that have at their core a 'networking logic' not only technological but also social.

"If you come in from the outside, it's very clear that people are still knit here very tightly on personal relationships, based on when they started as new graduates, where they got moved around the world, where they had jobs and they know each other... It's a very tightly knit culture and it's because of those relationships that things actually get communicated and work done." (Interview 5)

Social networks have always allowed us to create relational spaces in which knowledge is shared, disseminated and interchanged. The Corporation is very much based on those networks, they can help create and promote new ways of working without having to go through very formalised procedures. However 'traditional networking' presents us with the impossibility of mastering resources or focussing on task implementation beyond a certain level of complexity (Castells, 2001). Thus, traditional face-to-face networking only allows us to keep relatively small functioning

networks, whereas the new ICTs allow us to expand on that process and probably shape it differently. As we will see later on this is specially the case in creating new ventures in far away places like India. However, networks also imply certain degree of continuity within the organisation and that is why newcomers have problems having access to and using a previously established network:

“So that [the Corporation] people can provide the stronger bridges back into the networks that exist within a corporation this size and that the language of [the Corporation] is one that has to be decoded by new people, and you decode the words, you don't necessarily have the ability to understand the way the networks run that are using that code.” (Interview 2)

When connections and boundaries are blurred, a problem emerges on how to communicate and with whom one communicates, between needing to consult every decision or taking responsibility and between leadership and accountability. In a context where both life and work are intrinsically insecure and risk taking has become a necessity, networks provide support (Kelly, 1999). Thus networking might help to reduce risk and generate security. It is assumed that the bigger the networks are the better for everyone that participates in them. On the other hand, a heavy reliance on networks can become a burden for expansion and development. The tension is exposed clearly in the next quotation:

“ My belief about a consensus system is that it slows things down as a function. You can then argue about whether it speeds it up in the background or not, whether or not you can bring people online. I've never been in a culture where so many people feel like they need to be consulted and they want to argue and you say, so what's your alternative and then they go, oh actually, now that you mention it, it's pretty good.” (Interview 5)

The tendency to work mainly through informal networks means also that there is not a “good knowledge management process” in place that people can follow:

“we do not have a very good knowledge management process at this point, within any part of the organisation, let alone between the business creation part. So, how do they share that with us? And how do they share that with the bigger Corporate which sits above us as always, in everything we do which is to the benefit of.” (Interview 4)

It is clear through the stories that employees tell that the Corporation has an organizational structure, culture and a way of doing things that prompts people to stick with the known even when they decide to explore new areas. It therefore made sense to place new and old businesses as separated as possible. The idea was that each venture, including NIB, could operate under its own resource allocation criteria, performance measurement systems and reward structures. The aim was to increase the distance between legacy business and the new opportunities through the carving out

of different legally separate units. Anderson (1999) suggests that the most effective organisations evolve strategies that lie at the ‘edge of chaos’. Thus, when organisations maintain a balance between equilibrium and flexibility and allow for many small changes that might cumulate into radical strategic innovations allowing them to reach higher fitness levels -or better competence- to co-exist in their environment. NIB seems to have been an ‘exploration’ in the search for new markets for the Corporation. However, it was ‘an exploration’ that was failing not having had the space where both new knowledge and a new organisational structure could develop.

“Are we a centre of excellence that helps to bring value to the group by helping them exploit the internet, to improve their business process and generate more value or is our key focus developing new internet business, in terms of revenue for the group. So these two don't necessarily align with each other. Sometimes bringing value to a group doesn't necessarily generate revenue. It could be cost saving for the group and I find, in some ways, these are in conflict, the business objectives here.” (Interview 3)

“The existing projects are making no money. So, while they're all wonderful growth platforms and they have all the nice buzz words, at the end of the day we are a taker of cash in [the Corporation] and there is, I think, no path to profitability.” (Interview 5)

NIB and the India e-learning team: Ventures Expanding and Linking back

And yet when the corporation created NIB, its intention was to extend the brand and leverage on its name through the development of new ventures. The ideal for NIB was to be a *different but not separate* ‘entity’ from the main Corporation.

Within NIB, ventures were also seen as needing their own space to develop. The perception was that without their own resources, their own performance metrics and a distinctive organisational design, they would fail to develop the necessary entrepreneurial spirit. Also the aim was to benefit from the substantial business opportunities that can arise when people develop and interchange ideas, information and experiences beyond and across organisational boundaries. In order to achieve this, however businesses need a number of overlapping channels that effectively transmit soft information and make ‘remote people’ part of the local working spheres (Day et al., 2001). One of the main concerns at NIB in creating ventures that needed a distributed team was the ‘remote people management’ and the type of communication strategies that needed to be developed.

“We have people in London, India, Australia, Argentina, Houston and we have like one person in the Netherlands, one or two people in Germany, one or two people in Finland and I'm concerned that we're not managing, we've not matched the remote management of our teams and that concerns me in terms of their commitment, their engagement, our on the ground

understanding of what's happening there, what's happening with those businesses, what do they really think as opposed to what the executives in those countries may think" (Interview 4)

This concern is also reflected in the difficulty that isolated new businesses might have of rejoining the main mainstream, especially when they have developed new business models that are supposed to invigorate the operations they left behind. It was reproduced in the relationship between NIB and the venture we have looked at closely: the India e-learning team.

The India e-learning team had participants in two continents and three different locations: London, UK and Bombay and Delhi in India. The team we observed was involved in the planning and implementation of an e-learning project with six schools in India. In this venture NIB was trying to provide curriculum and non-curriculum content to schools in India online. Some other companies had attempted to do so in India before and they had not been successful. NIB concluded that those competitors failed because everything else that was necessary to bring that content to the schools and the children wasn't there. The schools needed teacher training, software, hardware, technical support, connectivity, infrastructure etc. and all that had to be ready for them as well. That was the main objective of the NIB India venture and provided an excellent link back to the Corporation.

"We want to be able to actually establish relationships with the consumer, ahead of the other business in the Corporation... and we think that, you know, e-learning is a good way of doing that and also the Corporation has always been involved in education, but from more of the socio-investment side. So we also have some in-house expertise in terms of corporate e-learning and want to see if we can capitalise on the technology itself and our experience and to see how we can establish something in that domain." (Interview 7)

However, the London manager of the India e-learning venture wanted the venture 'protected' from the political fights occurring at the HQ in London. Although keeping parts of the company separated might have helped to achieve the goals of growth, performance and the development of new ways of thinking, it did present a number of problems. The problems were associated primarily with the creation of new organizational boundaries between the India team and London. It also inhibited the flow of information and ideas between the two and thereby made it more likely that experiences and knowledge might be lost.

"It is very, very important that everybody in the team knows the company, knows the people working for the company, the network and the systems to relate back. Okay, like for example, in my case, I didn't know anything about the Corporation. There were very many times that I couldn't really take decisions because I was like, am I going to get myself into political

problems? Is there a structure that I should respect and I'm not doing it? So, luckily enough, my other two co-workers over there, they had been like forever with the company and they were able to direct me, but that really slowed me quite a lot. So had I known a bit more what the structure was, how did people react, what I could expect from the network, things would have been faster and easier.” (Interview 11)

The issue of identity and of how to relate to the different stakeholders involved became especially poignant within the venture. For instance among the India e-learning team recruited in Bombay and Delhi, people had doubts in terms of commitment of the Corporation to the project or to the possibility of still belonging to the Corporation if the project for which they were hired failed. In relation to this project the main question for its members was: is the Corporation going to absorb the people they are hiring for the India project if it fails or is it going to fire them?

“So, it's about trying to be absolutely clear what it is like to be part of this organisation, particularly in terms of some of the... let's say, the chaos and uncertainty. So you can be putting all of your energy into a project and then the project gets stopped, simply because it isn't proven to create enough value or it's decided something else. So that can be quite distressing if it's something that you've been involved with.” (Interview 7)

Within the venture: Organizational boundaries and flows of information

The employees describe the Indian venture as a very ambitious project that had to cope with all the problems of being developed in a remote location. Initially the project had a ‘venture manager’ that was basically trying to coordinate everything, a marketing specialist and a CTO (Chief Technology Officer). Later on it became obvious to the team that they needed a ‘good and straight project manager’ as well as a Launch Director to coordinate back to the Corporation. Once the ‘structural’ functions were covered the team turned their attention to the content. They hired a Content Manager with two people working for her, a science and a maths specialist and expand on the area of marketing business development hiring a business developer and incorporating a Finance Manager. The venture manager in India is the ‘top guy in the picture’ together with the Launch Director:

“...because even though there is a local team that is able to keep going, there always has to be a linkage with the central and that is what [the launch director is] doing at the moment.” (Interview 11)

Initially everything was created in Bombay just because part of the team were from there and because allegedly Bombay ‘is the new media capital of India’. As it happened when they started both partnering and selecting the members for the local

team, they found that everything ‘was happening in Delhi’.

“Our portal development agency, some of the hosting agencies and all the good candidates we were getting, everything was from Delhi. So that’s why, at the moment, we have to have both offices going on so [people] just travel to Delhi every week which is super tough for them. So there is even a virtual team between the virtual team...” (Interview 10)

Indeed, the distributed teams became part of what an NIB venture meant. This is not unusual since distributed teams are becoming increasingly common especially in multinational organisations. Just as technology facilitated information transmission around the world, it now enables globally distributed people to collaborate on issues and challenges that their organisation face at the international level (Maznevski and Chudoba, 2000). However, in this study we were looking at a team characterised among other things by using technology supported communication more than face-to-face communication and living and working in different countriesⁱⁱⁱ.

Virtuality is used here in connection with “the creation of electronic ties and the establishment of electronically sustained alliances of actors: i.e. networks, which are occasioned by the diffusion of current technology” (Kallinikos, 2001: 113). A virtual environment can have advantages and disadvantages in relation to formal and informal work networks. For instance virtual work can help to eliminate overheads and contribute to cost saving creating also greater autonomy for employees (Robey et al. 2003). On the other hand when teams are organised virtually they can become isolated from the core of the company, experience fears of negative impact in career development, employee exploitation and the physical problems of virtual communication. The following section presents some of the challenges that the India team faced.

Making the remote team part of the local working spheres

Under conditions of virtuality how is it possible to make the communication and interchange routines part of the current working spheres? Work is continuous and complex and people move fluidly from one task to the next. One of the problems with distributed teams is that the end of meetings often signal ‘out of sight, out of mind’ making the ‘remote’ not part of the continuity of each other’s working spheres (Mark, 1999). Within these ephemeral conditions, relationships are rarely based on belonging but rather on processes of ‘integration and disintegration’. Relationships

become informational than 'narrational' (Sennet, 1998). Thus, not based on mutual experience or common history but primarily on an exchange of data – 'catching up'.

The issue was how to develop the relationship *within* the team.

"...So there are a number of factors that help to influence a virtual team working and the creation of identity is critical. It's actually more critical in a virtual team than in a co-located team. People you bump into at the coffee machine every hour or so, you're bound to actually relate to in a very different way to people that you may speak to once every two or three days and can't see the expression on the face..." (Meeting 1)

The challenge then is to find a continuous way of 'being in touch' not only through weekly or bimonthly formal meetings, with occasional telephone or e-mail interchanges in between, but rather becoming 'part of' the team -even if remote- and therefore of the daily working life. This way of working also makes the development of social ties more difficult. For the India team it meant building a shared repository of common team materials and engaging in informal as well as formal communications, to build relationships outside of the formal meeting structure (Mark, 1999). However, in the India case the relationships developed between the team and the London's headquarters had an influence in the way people shared experiences and their decision making process.

"People are still there and they're very disconnected. Not sharing. Also the further you are from London, the more disconnected you are from the decisions, the thinking and our understanding of what's happened." (Meeting 2)

"...that's an issue. I would like them to take ownership in India for what they're doing because it's impossible really to make every operational decision in the project from London." (Interview 6)

Indeed, one of the main challenges that virtual teams face is that they can become isolated from the core of the company and experience fears of negative impact in career development besides the 'physical' problems of virtual communication that can create an impoverished emotional interaction with other Corporation and NIB's members. Furthermore, in breaking boundaries and allowing employees to shift identities –being part of the India team and the Corporation- virtuality makes more difficult to construct a recognisable career project (Kallinikos, 2001). Indeed, the short term projects and contracts made difficult for employees to develop a common narrative. In a sense detachment from the organisation seemed to be required, not involvement.

Developing a culture that supports motivation and co-operation

In order to communicate and work together groups develop their own frameworks of interpretation: shared assumptions and beliefs that are held by the members of a group as a learnt product of the group experience. It is important in order to develop a shared sense of identity to have sufficient common experiences to create a shared view. This presents a challenge for the distributed group whose members themselves might not be able to define who is a member of their social unit. It is not enough to present a set of recommendations that the group can follow. Culture in a team is affected by the group history, experience, the composition of its members etc. Within a virtual group, the nature and usage of the technology also plays a major role in shaping the way the group interacts and therefore the development of a shared interpretative and action oriented framework (Mark, 1999).

“[Now]...we’ve rented accommodation away from the main office. For practical reasons as well as for these reasons, in fairness ... it brings benefits because it then means that the new team can form its own identity, can create its own identity itself and it can hopefully avoid some of the worst elements of being part of the Corporation’s identity but pick up some of the best bits of being part of the Corporation and getting the Corporation’s identity, and it’s predominantly made up of new-to-Corporation people...” (Interview 6)

“It’s a very, very fine equilibrium between letting the local team act because they know the market and they know how things have to be done and share the knowledge of the central...I see it as a very, very fine equilibrium between trying to impose directives from the central and respecting the local vision of things. (Interview 11)

There were also aspects of interaction and conversational processes that are important when dealing with far away interactions and communications. Issues like the delay in the conversations, the problems of turn-taking in the conversation, the lack of interpretation when it comes to body language etc. also make difficult to ‘interpret’ on-line and telephone conversations and to provide an environment in which participation becomes easy.

“...one of the issues with just tele-conferencing is you tend not to pick up the personal. Immediately talking pure, hard, fast business issues yet the things that actually get in the way of forming sometimes aren’t those things at all...accent or dialect, language are all blockers, that are far greater blockers when it’s a virtual team and so, you’re talking on the telephone.” (Meeting 1)

According to Newell et al (2002) the development of new ways of organising conduces to more knowledge-intensive work but it also makes it more difficult to manage. Trust here is also reconfigured in scribed in informational social bonds, bonds based less in hierarchical relations and more in the complex, reciprocal

intricacies of the transverse networks of information exchange. Trust is then based less on continuous face-to-face work relations and more on iterated work relations of a short duration; less on the knowledge of someone's character and more on the knowledge of someone's resources and his/her position in the social field. Giddens (1992) calls this active trust, a matter of mutual influence rather than mutual fatedness. Furthermore, in an organisation that relies on networks there tend to be less rules and procedures that frame communication, therefore knowledge can be 'lost'. There is also less hierarchy. This implies that there are less middle managers to act as coordinators or 'information brokers' between for instance the Corporation and the different ventures and therefore subordinates must control their own activities. It is then that the organisation tends to become more 'stretched' and virtual and when participation can become an issue.

Participation

Without a cooperative environment is also difficult to achieve a high level of participation by all members of the team. Some of the themes emphasised during our conversations with NIB's employees in the India project were ownership, individual responsibility, and dissent. Thus, people felt that participation also meant to have space for dissent and conflict, allowing discussions and disagreements to surface through the communications.

"... if the project, is to meet its deliverables and people are to feel that they own the output..."
(Meeting 1)

"The local manager was refusing to allow... any dissent from the team members. He wanted to demonstrate a unified face to what he considered to be the shareholder boss. The consequence of that was that problems that could and should have surfaced early were being pushed under the carpet, not seen or heard at all by the people who continue to fund the project, until it was too late.." (Interview 4)

Cooperation and participation were seen as crucial for the development of both the Ventures and the NIB team by the India Launch Manager since:

"... the values themselves are going to change, as sure as heck, as our team grows. As our recruitment grows in India, then the values that a bunch of Caucasians in London and Houston put together, are they going to be the right values for the NIB tomorrow if actually 33% of our staff is in India? Probably not. So even if we don't want to, we need to cooperate" (Interview 7)

However things had started to change between the corporation and NIB and therefore between NIB and its different ventures.

“In the beginning, everybody wanted to work for NIB, like a new business in [the Corporation], you know, people said it's risky but it's exciting. This was spring 2000. Now, we're in a different time zone. People are saying, no, I don't want to go to NIB. They haven't delivered last year, it cost a lot of money, there is a risk for everyone that works in NIB, if you want to be in [the Corporation] long term...” (Interview 5)

In June 2002, NIB together with two other new business created by the Corporation few months before, became re-organised under a third business called Corporation Consumer. NIB ceased to exist officially, although most of its employees remained as part of the Corporation. The India e-learning team, despite having done “an excellent job” in the words of their Launch Manager, was suspended, its employees are now working for other companies and most of them not longer part of the Corporation. The following quote summarises the feelings of most of the team members regarding the breaking up and stopping of the ventures.

“ We're talking about a company that has been around for a long time. So they're very stuck in the way of doing things. The Corporation like any big organisation, has a bit of arrogance. That being us, we're successful. We know how to do things, therefore everything is going to be rosy and no, things are not always rosy at all. So, that arrogance sometimes it is a problem particularly when you have a geographical and a cultural distance. Sometimes had the central been a bit more humble and listened a bit more to the local team and their needs, a few things could have been avoided.” (Interview 11)

In general virtual teams exist in adaptive work environments (Duarte and Snyder, 1999). Their work as we have seen is in constant change with new problems always in the horizon. The India e-learning team worked in a highly unstructured environment with little known rules. Within more technical environments –structured and more regulated- teams can address work with tested methods in a world where variables can be contained, surprises minimised and where mapping, predictability and repetition are the norm. However, an adaptive environment like the one described by the India e-learning team did not have structured rules and the team had not yet develop satisfactory responses to the problems they faced. Many employees tend to prefer more technical environments where risk, uncertainty and discomfort are lower (Duarte and Snyder, 1999). However adaptive environments can generate innovative solutions to new challenges that the Corporation might have benefited from.

Discussion

This paper has looked at the processes of knowledge sharing and generation among organisational collectives during the creation of new business ventures. Through the stories that NIB employees tell we have seen how there is a very clear

tension between: 1) the strong culture of the parent Corporation's powerful informal networks and the taken for granted nature of its knowledge 'sharing and generating system' -represented on standards, ways of working, norms, accountability procedures etc.- and 2) the efforts by employees at NIB to develop a culture and an identity on their own. This new NIB identity would have had implications for the type of 'market niche' they would have created for themselves outside -in the market- and also inside -among the more than 1800 businesses that compose the Corporation. As Kanter (2001) suggests, organisations that develop networks internal to their organization are able to deal with knowledge more effectively; whereas through external networks they can have better access to additional intellectual and market resources co-evolving better with their environment. It is the coordination and eventual co-evolution of these internal and external networks that equip organizations to enable spaces where knowledge sharing and creation can occur.

NIB's employees were aware of the double need of belonging to the Corporation but developing a different way of organising. Thus, they needed the experience, knowledge and support of the Corporation and at the same time enough space to self-organise on their own. They attempted to explore and find the niche where they could grow, contribute and 'add value back' to the Corporation. The social networks both at NIB and at the Corporation acted as enablers and at the same time as inhibitors of that process.

Social networks were enablers in allowing people to share and develop new ways of relating and sharing without having to go through very standardised/explicit organisational arrangements to do so. However they have 'continuity and maintenance' needs on their own. They indeed have their own emergent structural properties and underlying logic that can present itself as a constraint for 'new comers' that need to 'play the system' before they can gain access to and use it. For example, in the India e-learning project, people were allowed to explore and develop their own ways of doing things in India away from the constraints that the Corporation would have represented had they been in London. However the very fact of having been far away and protected by their launch manager in the London HQ from potential 'interferences' created a barrier for the India team to be part of the Corporation and benefit for a possible future inside it. This protected situation created extra-organisational boundaries for the team when it came to i) learn from the Corporation and ii) to be able to contribute back to it. Their own development was both aided and

aborted.

Indeed, the participation and maintenance of the social networks within the organisation is central to the employees' stories. However, within these networks the agent at the end of the line of communication does not appear relevant any longer. The network seems to be gradually replacing the old organisational setting based on a rationalised bureaucracy with a very clear and identifiable receptor at the end of that communication line. Mobility, inter-activity and pervasive connectednesses are emphasised and have an impact on the way people organise themselves. The individuals included in the network are being empowered by this transformation. However, it also leads to extreme vulnerability for those excluded from the network, and with little bargaining power to negotiate working conditions.

At the root of the employees' stories, there is a process of differentiation. What employees seem to suggest is that the emerging ways of organising in which they participate do not take the form of a group in which they depend on others as colleagues, as members, as people. The organisation that is emerging creates a different type of bonding. People eventually depend on others through what it is represented through the network of communications. In other words, the 'development' seems to be towards more dependence on communication channels and on how people communicate rather than on who is at the other side of the communication channel. This expansion of a networking form of organisation, even if it augments the human powers of organising and integration, also undermines our concept of a separate, independent subject helping to subvert the notions of sovereignty and self-sufficiency. This process includes also the search and the creation of difference through the comparison with the 'Other'. That is, employees' tell of two forms of organising: one that tends towards connectivity and homogeneity but that provokes and runs hand in hand with the construction of difference, boundaries, distinctiveness and uniqueness (Hall and du Guy, 1996).

This is reflected in the way we relate at work and through work. We have seen in our example how the social bond at work was less bureaucratic and more informational, increasingly created on a project-by-project basis by the movement of ideas and the establishment of only temporary standards and protocols. This 'network sociality' (Wittel, 2001) is emerging alongside and sometimes displacing the idea of the organisation as a community. A community entails 'stability, coherence, embeddedness and belonging' (Wittel, 2001:51); it involves strong ties, proximity and

a common history or narrative of the collective. However, the sociality that the network represents does not involve so much belonging but rather processes of social integration and disintegration. In this sociality relationships are not 'narrational' but informational, not based on mutual experience or common history but primarily on an exchange of data or catching up (Sennet, 1998).

More empirical attention will need to be devoted to networking, as social practice is under-researched, it lacks solid empirical data and it needs ethnographical exploration. The relationship between different forms of capital: social, economic. Cultural. Bourdieu (1986) emphasises the convertibility of these different forms of capital. How is social capital transformed, transferred, translated into economic capital? How is the antagonism between functionality and morality negotiated in the network sociality? Micro-dynamics of the network relations: trust, loyalty, hierarchy, power and conflict need to be addressed and investigated in the framework of networking.

The notion of a network can also shadow issues of power in knowledge distribution. Differences in knowledge –e.g. its presence or absence in particular collectives- gives much of the momentum for our social interaction, from gossip to the division of labour. As Barth (2002:1) says: “we must share some knowledge to be able to communicate and usually must differ in some knowledge to give focus to our interaction”.

The final question would be then how to allow for the development of local knowledges and ways of working while sustaining the collective intellectual capital of a company? How to allow for both the development of new organised structures and new knowledge? A way forward may be enabling the construction of a 'knowledge space...an interstitial space, a space that is created through negotiation between spaces' and that allows the 'fertilisation of different knowledge traditions' and different ways of working (Turnbull, 2000).

This research has presented the active members of a network not as passive recipients of actions and knowledge being imposed by other more powerful members of the network. Neither has portrayed the network as static resource on which networkers tap on when needing individual benefits (Sell-Trujillo, 2001). Networking is seen here as a social practice a new kind of sociality, an emergent and complex process.

Comment [LST1]: Ummm... I see what you mean, but I did not get that picture from reading the extracts you included; even though as with a community, it does not seem to require stability and proximity, to me there must be some form of 'code' of entry given that the people reported having to re-start and work on the network (so then, they were not 'doing it right'). It is a form of relationship, but obviously if it gets compared with that of community members it will 'fail' as it is different.

Bibliography

- Alavi, M. and Leidner, D. E. "Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: conceptual foundations and research issues." *MIS Quarterly* 25(1) (2001):107-136.
- Alonso, A. M. "The effects of truth: Re-presentations of the past and the imagining of community." *Journal of historical sociology* 1(1) (1988) 33-57.
- Alvesson, M. (1995) *Management of knowledge-intensive companies*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Alvesson, M. and Karreman, D. (2001). "Odd couple: Making sense of the curious concept of knowledge management." *Journal of management studies* 38 (7): 995-1018.
- Anderson, P. (1999) "Complexity theory and organisational science." *Organisation science* 10(3): 216-232.
- Barth, F. "An anthropology of knowledge." *Current Anthropology* 43 (1) (2002):1-18.
- Brown, J. S. and Duguid, P. (2001) "Knowledge and Organization." *Organization Science* 12(2) : 198-213.
- Castells, M (2001) *The Internet Galaxy: reflections on the Internet, business and society*. Oxford: Oxford university Press.
- Chidambaram, L and Bostrom, R.P. "Group development (I): A review and synthesis of development models." *Group decision and negotiation* 6(2) (1997): 159-187.
- Cook, S. D. N. and Brown, J. S. (1999) "Bridging Epistemologies: The generative dance between organisational knowledge and organisational knowing." *Organizational Science*, 10(4): 381-400.
- Cross, R.; Parker, A. and Borgatti, S. P. (2002). *A bird's eye view: Using social network analysis to improve knowledge creation and sharing*. IMB Institute for Knowledge-Based Organisations Publication.
- Day, J. D. Mang, P.Y. Ritcher, A. and Roberts, J. (2001) "The innovative organization." *The McKinsey Quarterly* (2).
- Duarte, D. L and Snyder, N. T. (1999) *Mastering virtual teams*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass. Publishers.
- Hall, S. and du Guy, P. (1996) *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage.
- Hansen, M. T., Nohria, N. and Thomas T. (1999) "What's your strategy for managing knowledge?" *Harvard Business Review* 77(2):106-116.
- Holsapple, C. W. and Joshi, K.D. (2002) "Knowledge management: A threefold framework." *The Information Society* 18: 47-64.
- Hosking, D. M. and Morley, I.E. *A Social Psychology of Organizing*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- Kallinikos, J. (2001) *The age of flexibility*. Sweden: Academia Acta.
- Kallinikos, J. "Organized Complexity: Posthumanist Remarks on the Technologizing of Intelligence." *Organization* 5(3) (1998): 371-396.
- Kallinikos, J. (2004). *Networks as alternative forms of organisation*. LSE Information Systems Department. Unpublished research paper.
- Kanter, R.M. (2001) *Evolve! Succeeding in the digital culture of tomorrow*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kauffmann, S.A. (2000) *Investigations*. Oxford university press. London.
- Kluge, J.; Stein, W. and Licht, T. (2001) *Knowledge unplugged: the McKinsey and Company global survey on knowledge management*. New York: Palgrave.
- Mark, G. (1999) "Some challenges facing virtually collocated teams." *Information Technologies in Organizational Processes: Field Studies and Theoretical Reflections on the Future of Work*. IFIP Working Group 8.2 Conference St Louis, Missouri, USA.
- Morgan, G. (1986) *Images of organisation*. London: Sage.
- Newell, S; Robertson, M; Scarbrough, H and Swan, J. (2002) *Managing knowledge work*. New York: Palgrave.
- Robey, D et al. (2003) "Intertwining material and virtual work." *Information and organization* 13, 111-129.
- Sennet, R. (1998) *The corrosion of character*. London: Norton.
- Tsoukas, H. (1996) "The firm as a distributed knowledge system: a constructionist approach."

- Strategic Management Journal* 17 (Winter Special Issue), 11-25.
- Turnbull, D. *Masons, tricksters and cartographers*. Hardwood academic Publishers: Amsterdam. 2000.
- Van Maanen, J. (1982) *Varieties of qualitative research. Studying organisations: Innovations in methodology*. London: Sage.
- Wittel, A.. (2001) Toward a Network sociality. *Theory, Culture and Society* Vol 18(6):51-76.
- Weick, K. E. *Sense making in organisations*. London: Sage, 1995.
- Wenger, E. (2000) "Communities of practice and social learning systems." *Organisation* 7(2): 225-246.
- West, M. E. "Reflexivity and group effectiveness: a conceptual integration." In: *Handbook of work group psychology*, (1996) 555-579.
- Griffin, D.; Shaw, P. and Stacy, R. "Speaking on complexity in management theory and practice." *Organization* 5(3) (1998): 315-339.
- Hall, S. and du Guy, P. *Questions of cultural identity*. London: Sage, 1996.
- Hansen, M. T., Nohria, N. and Thomas T. "What's your strategy for managing knowledge?" *Harvard Business Review* 77(2) (1999):106-116.
- Holsapple, C. W. and Joshi, K.D. "Knowledge management: A threefold framework." *The Information Society* 18 (2002): 47-64.
- Janis, I.L. *Victims of groupthink: A psychological study of foreign policy decisions and fiascos*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1972.
- Katzenback, J.R. and Smith, D.K. *The wisdom of teams: creating the high performance organization*. McKinsey and Company Inc., 1993.
- Kluge, J.; Stein, W. and Licht, T. *Knowledge unplugged: the McKinsey and Company global survey on knowledge management*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Mark, G. "Some challenges facing virtually collocated teams." *Information Technologies in Organizational Processes: Field Studies and Theoretical Reflections on the Future of Work*. IFIP Working Group 8.2 Conference St Louis, Missouri, USA, 1999.
- Mastenbroek, W.F. *Conflict management and organisation development*. Wiley: Holland, 1987.
- McGrawth, J.E. *Groups: Interaction and performance*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1984.
- McGrawth, J.E. Time, interaction and performance (TIP): A theory of groups. *Small group research* 2(2) (1991):147-174.
- Morgan, G. *Images of organisation*. London: Sage, 1986.
- Murh, T. *ATLAS.ti: The knowledge workbench. User's manual*. Berlin: Scientific software development, 1997.
- Newell, S; Robertson, M; Scarbrough, H and Swan, J. *Managing knowledge work*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. *The knowledge-creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford university Press, 1995.
- Okhuysen, G.A. and Eisenhardt, K "Integrating knowledge in groups: How formal interventions enable flexibility." *Organisational Science* 13 (4) (2002) : 370-386.
- Schultze, U. "Investigating the contradictions in knowledge management." *Information Systems: Current Issues and Future Changes*, IFIP 8.2. Conference in Helsinki, 1998.
- Smircich, L. "Concepts of Culture and Organisational Analysis." *Administrative science quarterly*, 28, (1983) : 339-58.
- Thomas, J.B., Sussman, S.W. and Henderson, J.C. "Understanding Strategic Learning: Linking organisational learning, knowledge management, and sense making." *Organisational Science* 12(3) (2001): 331-345.

¹ I.e. tacit or explicit, reason or experience, 'knowing that' or 'knowing how', sticky or leaky etc.

² Lev Manovich (2001) calls databases the dominant symbolic form of the 21st century. In contrast to the image or the novel, they do not have a narrative any longer; no beginning no middle, no storyline, no hierarchy. They are a collection of individual items, each of them having the same significance and the same status. Databases grow they are never completed. Bauman (1998) says that whereas the panopticon is an instrument of the state the database is an instrument of the market. The main purpose of the panopticon is to instil discipline, to impose a uniform pattern of behaviour and to keep people in place. It is a weapon against

difference. The database however is an instrument of separation, exclusion and selection.

ⁱⁱⁱ Lipnack and Stamps (1997) define a virtual team as “a group of people who interact through interdependent tasks guided by common purpose...across space, time, and organisational boundaries with links strengthened by webs of communication technologies”.