

## University of Groningen

### Virtualness

Bosch-Sijtsema, P.M.

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2003

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bosch-Sijtsema, P. M. (2003). Virtualness: a new organisational dimension s.n.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

VIRTUALNESS: A NEW ORGANISATIONAL  
DIMENSION.

*The relationship between virtualness and knowledge*

Petra Bosch-Sijtsema

Publisher: Labyrint Publication  
P.O. Box 662  
2900 AR Capelle a/d IJssel  
The Netherlands

Printed by: Offsetdrukkerij Ridderprint B.V., Ridderkerk

ISBN 90-5335-010-1

© 2003, P. Bosch-Sijtsema

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system of any nature, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying or recording, without prior written permission of the copyright-owner.

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT GRONINGEN

Virtualness: a new organisational dimension.  
The relationship between virtualness and knowledge

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de  
Bedrijfskunde  
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen  
op gezag van de  
Rector Magnificus, dr. F. Zwarts,  
in het openbaar te verdedigen op  
donderdag 9 januari 2003  
om 14.15 uur.

door

Petra Margreet Bosch-Sijtsema

geboren op 13 mei 1971  
te Veenwouden

Promotores:

Prof. dr. R.J.J.M. Jorna

Prof. dr. A.M. Sorge

Beoordelingscommissie:

Prof.dr. ir. J.M.L. van Engelen

Prof. dr. B. Nooteboom

Prof. dr. J. Swan

## Acknowledgements

---

The research for the dissertation was carried out at two sites. The first part of the research was performed within the department of business administration and management at the Blekinge Institute of Technology in Southern Sweden (Ronneby) and financed by EnerSearch AB. I concluded a licentiate (degree in between master and PhD title) at Lund University, faculty of Business Administration under the supervision of Professor Rikard Larsson. After the licentiate, I continued my research at the University of Groningen, faculty of Management and Organisation, department Knowledge Management in the Netherlands. In Sweden the first two case studies were performed, and in the Netherlands, the third case study was investigated.

First, I would like to thank my former supervisor Professor Rikard Larsson of Lund University for his time and guidance during the licentiate study and for helpful comments during the final stages of the PhD. Furthermore, I express my gratitude for the guidance and discussions of Professor René Jorna and Professor Arndt Sorge, who supervised my last two years in Groningen. I want to thank them for their guidance and support of the last two years of the research. I especially appreciated the discussions we had in which René and Arndt complemented each other in their expert fields.

Secondly, I would like to thank a number of people in Sweden, who have given me the opportunity and motivation to start my research and finish a licentiate book in Lund. I would like to thank the organisation EnerSearch AB and in particular the CEO Hans Ottosson, who gave me the chance to perform my PhD-studies towards the licentiate title. A warm thanks is for all members of ISES (especially Claus Baderschneider and Maria Passby) who helped me with my data collection and supported the research and with whom many discussions have been held about what a virtual organisation really is.

Furthermore, the contact persons for the second and third case study have been helpful in introducing and supporting the empirical research, a special thanks is to Professor Hans Akkermans who introduced me into the world of knowledge management, and to Robert Jan Messemaeckers the contact person of the third case study.

Professor Michael Driver, University of Southern California (USA) has helped with the first case study, the questionnaires and the data collected. Discussions about knowledge and knowledge management have been held with Professor Jacques Boersma. Furthermore, I want to thank the reading committee members for their time and constructive remarks, Professor Jo van Engelen, Professor Bart Nooteboom and Professor Jacky Swan.

During my time in Groningen, I was part of the department of knowledge management and we had a number of fruitful and motivating research discussions within our group. These discussions and presentations have helped me to reflect and to explore certain aspects of my data further. I would like to acknowledge the group members for the discussions and the social events we had together. Furthermore the SOM research school has supported the practical arrangements of the PhD.

The paranimfen helped to arrange the practical details of the promotion day. With Marianna I could discuss the ups and downs of life as a PhD student. A warm thanks is

to Sonja Rispens (paranimf) who was my roommate and friend during my stay in Groningen. Thanks Sonja for being there when it was most needed and for the numerous critical discussions, reflections, ideas and the personal matters.

Thanks to the work and private related discussions, coffee hours and social gatherings, it was possible to keep up the motivation, thanks Larissa, Ayse, Niels, Xander, Ruben, Filippo, Mark, Martin and Gerben and other colleagues of the faculty of Management and organisation.

I also would like to thank my former colleagues and friends at Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden, for interesting discussions on methodology, PhD-courses, learning literature and life as a PhD student. In particular I would like to thank: Marie Jönsson, Maria Passby, Monica Nilsson, Marie Hemming, Frank Ulbrich, Åke Uhlin, Anders Nilsson and Anders Hederstierna. Thank you for your support in Sweden.

A special thanks is towards to Sonja Abels, Durkje van Lingen-Elzinga and Ellen Flikkema for their secretarial and most importantly their moral support.

Finally, a warm thanks is to, my parents for support and to my own family of Jan, David and Nathan. They helped to keep the mind from only research and to keep my sanity during difficult times. Jan has supported and guided me through the work and was open to listen to new ideas and research problems. You were able to give an abstract and neutral picture of all the complex aspects I was working on and you kept on motivating me over all these years.

Petra Bosch-Sijtsema  
Groningen (NL), Januari 2003

# Table of contents

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>Tables and Figures</b>                             | iv |
| <b>1. The degree of virtualness</b>                   |    |
| 1.1 Virtual organisations, IT and knowledge           | 1  |
| 1.1.1 Technological developments                      | 2  |
| 1.1.2 Virtual organisation                            | 3  |
| 1.1.3 Knowledge                                       | 6  |
| 1.2 Virtualness discussion                            | 7  |
| 1.2.1 The notion virtual                              | 7  |
| 1.2.2 Virtualness                                     | 9  |
| 1.3 Discussion on dimensions of virtualness           | 10 |
| 1.3.1 Time  | 11 |
| 1.3.2 Involves  | 11 |
| 1.3.3 Co-ordination                                   | 13 |
| 1.3.4 IT, information distribution and communication  | 16 |
| 1.3.5 Space   | 18 |
| 1.3.6 Conclusion                                      | 20 |
| 1.4 Research problem and purpose                      | 22 |
| 1.5 Structure of the dissertation                     | 23 |
| <b>2. Context of virtualness</b>                      |    |
| 2.1 Introduction                                      | 25 |
| 2.2 Different perspectives                            | 25 |
| 2.3 Interorganisational perspective                   | 27 |
| 2.4 Intra-organisational perspective                  | 29 |
| 2.4.1 Structure                                       | 30 |
| 2.4.2 Communication and information distribution      | 30 |
| 2.5 Trust and Expectation                             | 31 |
| 2.5.1 Expectations                                    | 32 |
| 2.5.2 Expectations related to virtualness             | 34 |
| 2.6 Co-ordination                                     | 37 |
| 2.6.1 Co-ordination mechanisms                        | 38 |
| 2.6.2 Co-ordination mechanisms related to virtualness | 40 |
| 2.6.3 Conclusion                                      | 43 |
| <b>3. Knowledge development and transfer</b>          |    |
| 3.1 Introduction                                      | 45 |
| 3.2 Knowledge bearer and learning perspective         | 46 |
| 3.3 Discussion of knowledge theory                    | 48 |
| 3.3.1 Knowledge types                                 | 48 |
| 3.3.2 Knowledge transfer                              | 51 |
| 3.3.3 Knowledge constructs                            | 53 |
| 3.3.4 Conclusion of knowledge literature              | 55 |
| 3.4 Concepts in learning literature                   | 55 |
| 3.4.1 Learning mechanisms and outcomes                | 57 |
| 3.4.2 Criticism on organisational learning theory     | 58 |
| 3.4.3 Conclusion                                      | 58 |



|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 3.5 Knowledge and virtualness                               | 59  |
| 3.5.1 Interorganisational learning theory                   | 59  |
| 3.5.2 Virtualness versus knowledge transfer and development | 60  |
| 3.5.3 Conclusion  | 63  |
| <b>4. Frame of dimensions</b>                               |     |
| 4.1 Theoretical framework                                   | 64  |
| 4.1.1 Degree of virtualness                                 | 64  |
| 4.1.2 Context of virtualness                                | 65  |
| 4.1.3 Knowledge transfer and development                    | 65  |
| 4.1.4 Consequences of virtualness on knowledge              | 65  |
| 4.1.5 Conclusion  | 66  |
| <b>5. Research methodology</b>                              |     |
| 5.1 Introduction  | 67  |
| 5.2 Interpretive systems thinking                           | 67  |
| 5.3 Investigation phases                                    | 68  |
| 5.4 Case studies  | 69  |
| 5.5 Multiple data collection methods                        | 72  |
| 5.5.1 Qualitative method                                    | 73  |
| 5.5.2 Quantitative method                                   | 75  |
| 5.6 Data interpretation                                     | 76  |
| 5.6.1 Reliability and validity                              | 78  |
| <b>6. Case study A: New Communication Means</b>             |     |
| 6.1 Introduction  | 80  |
| 6.2 Description of the project organisation A               | 81  |
| 6.3 Degree of virtualness of case A                         | 83  |
| 6.4 Contextual aspects of virtualness                       | 84  |
| 6.4.1 Co-ordination and structure of case A                 | 85  |
| 6.4.2 Involvees   | 88  |
| 6.4.3 Expectations of individual members                    | 91  |
| 6.4.4 Time  | 96  |
| 6.4.5 Communication and information distribution            | 96  |
| 6.5 Knowledge development and transfer                      | 98  |
| 6.6 Relation between virtualness and knowledge              | 100 |
| 6.7 Conclusion  | 102 |
| <b>7. Case study B: Energy Savings</b>                      |     |
| 7.1 Description of the project organisation B               | 105 |
| 7.2 Degree of virtualness                                   | 106 |
| 7.3 Contextual aspects of virtualness                       | 107 |
| 7.3.1 Co-ordination and structure                           | 107 |
| 7.3.2 Involvees   | 109 |
| 7.3.3 Expectations of individual members                    | 110 |
| 7.3.4 Time  | 112 |
| 7.3.5 Communication and information distribution            | 112 |
| 7.4 Knowledge development and transfer                      | 113 |
| 7.5 Relation between virtualness and knowledge              | 114 |
| 7.6 Conclusion  | 117 |
| 7.7 Interproject knowledge transfer between A and B         | 118 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>8. Case Study C: The Infrastructure Case</b>   |     |
| 8.1 Introduction                                  | 121 |
| 8.2 Description of the project organisation C     | 121 |
| 8.3 Degree of virtualness of case C               | 124 |
| 8.4 Contextual aspects of virtualness             | 125 |
| 8.4.1 Co-ordination and structure                 | 125 |
| 8.4.2 Involvees                                   | 127 |
| 8.4.3 Expectations of individual members          | 129 |
| 8.4.4 Time  | 132 |
| 8.4.4 Communication and information distribution  | 132 |
| 8.5 Knowledge development and transfer            | 134 |
| 8.6 Relation between virtualness and knowledge    | 136 |
| 8.7 Conclusion                                    | 138 |
| 8.8 Interproject knowledge transfer of project C  | 139 |
| <b>9. Comparative case study analysis</b>         |     |
| 9.1 Introduction                                  | 142 |
| 9.2 Degree of virtualness                         | 142 |
| 9.3 Contextual aspects of virtualness             | 143 |
| 9.3.1 Co-ordination and structure                 | 143 |
| 9.3.2 Time  | 145 |
| 9.3.3 Involvees                                   | 145 |
| 9.3.4 Expectations                                | 147 |
| 9.3.5 Communication and information distribution  | 150 |
| 9.4 Knowledge transfer and development            | 151 |
| 9.5 Relation between virtualness and knowledge    | 156 |
| 9.6 Conclusion                                    | 159 |
| <b>10. Discussion and contribution</b>            |     |
| 10.1 Introduction                                 | 161 |
| 10.2 Degree of virtualness                        | 161 |
| 10.3 Contextual aspects                           | 162 |
| 10.3.1 Communication structure                    | 163 |
| 10.3.2 Communication of knowledge                 | 163 |
| 10.3.3 Coordination mechanism                     | 165 |
| 10.4 Expectations of different parties            | 168 |
| 10.5 Virtualness related to knowledge             | 172 |
| 10.6 Contribution                                 | 178 |
| 10.6.1 Comparing cases                            | 179 |
| 10.6.2 Contributions in organisational science    | 179 |
| 10.6.3 Practical contributions                    | 182 |
| 10.7 Future research                              | 183 |
| <b>Bibliography</b>                               | 184 |
| <b>Appendix</b>                                   |     |
| I: Virtual Organisation Questionnaire version 1.0 | 200 |
| II: Interview questions of 1998 (ISES and KEES)   | 206 |
| III: Codification scheme                          | 208 |
| IV: Labelling process                             | 211 |
| V: Samenvatting/ summary                          | 213 |

## Tables and figures

---

### Tables:

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1.1 Overview of dimensions for defining virtualness and contextual aspects               | 21  |
| 2.1 Three fields in VO-literature  | 26  |
| 2.2 Confirmation and dis-confirmation of positive and negative expectations              | 33  |
| 3.1 Differences between organisation learning approaches                                 | 47  |
| 3.2 Typology of knowledge  | 50  |
| 5.1 Key characteristics of all three case studies  | 71  |
| 5.2 Data collection with three case studies  | 75  |
| 5.3 Questionnaire response in general and specified to project leader and project member | 76  |
| 6.1 Output/ input analysis Case A: 1996-1998   | 85  |
| 6.2 Co-ordination mechanism within case A from starting phase to ending phase            | 88  |
| 6.3 Matches and mismatches of expectations within case study A                           | 95  |
| 6.4 General ratings of communication modes in case A, 1996 and 1998                      | 97  |
| 6.5 Knowledge creation for case study A  | 98  |
| 6.6 Relating the contextual aspects of case A to virtualness and knowledge               | 103 |
| 7.1 Output/ input analysis for case study B  | 108 |
| 7.2 Co-ordination mechanisms for case study B  | 109 |
| 7.3 Matches and mismatches of expectations within case study B                           | 112 |
| 7.4 General ratings of communication modes of case B                                     | 113 |
| 7.5 Knowledge creation for case study B  | 114 |
| 7.6 Relating the contextual aspects of case B to virtualness and knowledge               | 118 |
| 8.1 Co-ordination mechanisms of case C from starting to end phase                        | 127 |
| 8.2 Expectation matches and mismatches of organisation C                                 | 131 |
| 8.3 Communication of members of the project control department of case C                 | 133 |
| 8.4 Knowledge creation for organisation C  | 136 |
| 8.5 Relating the contextual aspects of case C to virtualness and knowledge               | 140 |
| 9.1 Degree of virtualness of three case studies  | 143 |
| 9.2 Comparing co-ordination and co-ordination mechanisms for three case studies.         | 144 |
| 9.3 Comparison on involvees of three case studies  | 146 |
| 9.4 Comparison of expectation conflicts of three case studies                            | 149 |
| 9.5 Comparison of communication between the three case studies                           | 151 |
| 9.6 Knowledge transfer and content of all three case studies A, B, and C                 | 155 |
| 9.7 Relating virtualness to knowledge for all three case studies                         | 158 |
| 9.8 Knowledge transfer for all three case studies  | 159 |
| 10.1 Conclusion about three different degrees of virtualness                             | 167 |
| 10.2 Relationship between contextual aspects, virtualness and project knowledge          | 176 |

## Figures:

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1.1 The interorganisational co-operation and its environment   | 5   |
| 1.2 Conceptual model for the research  | 21  |
| 1.3 Structure of the dissertation  | 24  |
| 4.1 Theoretical framework of the research  | 67  |
| 6.1 Figure of case study A in 1996-97  | 81  |
| 6.2 Case study A, connections between the micro and macro level                                      | 82  |
| 6.3 Degree of virtualness for case study A   | 84  |
| 6.4 Communication map of case A in 1996  | 86  |
| 6.5 Communication map of case A in 1998  | 86  |
| 6.6 Gap between academia and industry and technology and social science                              | 90  |
| 6.7 Knowledge creation process case study A, during 1996-1998  | 100 |
| 7.1 Figure of case study B   | 105 |
| 7.2 Degree of virtualness for case study B   | 107 |
| 7.3 Communication map of case study B  | 108 |
| 8.1 Phases in project C  | 122 |
| 8.2 The project organisation of case C   | 123 |
| 8.3 Degree of virtualness of case study C  | 124 |
| 8.4 Communication map of case C  | 125 |
| 9.1 Degree of virtualness for all three case studies   | 142 |
| 10.1 Contextual aspects related to virtualness degree  | 168 |
| 10.2 Relationship between expectations and learning  | 171 |
| 10.3 Knowledge transfer levels in co-operative project structures, with a high degree of virtualness | 173 |