

## **Learning in personal networks: Collaborative knowledge production in virtual forums**

February 2006



Center on Organizational Innovation

*Gernot Grabher and Julia Maintz*

*Socio-economics of Space*

*University of Bonn*

*grabher@giub.uni-bonn.de, maintz@giub.uni-bonn.de*

Center on Organizational Innovation  
Columbia University in the City of  
New York  
803 International Affairs, MC 3355  
420 West 118<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10027  
<http://www.coi.columbia.edu>

This online paper may be quoted under fair use and academic conventions. This paper may not be published elsewhere in any form (including e-mail lists and electronic bulleting boards) without the author's express permission.

The preferred citation for this paper is: Gernot Grabher and Julia Maintz. February 2006. "Learning in personal networks: Collaborative knowledge production in virtual forums," Working Papers Series, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University. Available online at [http://www.coi.columbia.edu/pdf/grabher\\_maintz\\_lpn.pdf](http://www.coi.columbia.edu/pdf/grabher_maintz_lpn.pdf).

**Learning in personal networks:  
Collaborative knowledge production in virtual forums**

*Gernot Grabher and Julia Maintz*

*Socio-economics of Space*

*University of Bonn*

*grabher@giub.uni-bonn.de, maintz@giub.uni-bonn.de*

## **Learning in personal networks: Collaborative knowledge production in virtual forums**

*Gernot Grabher and Julia Maintz*

*Socio-economics of Space*

*University of Bonn*

*grabher@giub.uni-bonn.de, maintz@giub.uni-bonn.de*

### **I The starting point: the shifting locus of knowledge production and innovation**

The more recent debates on innovation and learning have indicated a remarkable shift in the *locus* of knowledge production. Up until the early 1990s, innovation research focused mainly on knowledge production and learning in *formal organizational* arrangements. The prime focus, in other words, was on firms, their ties with clients, suppliers, and research institutions. During the 1990s, however, this focus was extended and interest increasingly shifted to *informal* and *personal* networks as effective vehicles for producing, storing, and disseminating knowledge. The debate on “communities of practice” epitomizes this shift towards informal and personal networks as means for interactive learning most prominently.

The concept was introduced by Lave and Wenger (1991) referring to groups of persons engaged in the same practice who are interested in enhancing individual competencies, communicate regularly, and share a common repertoire of resources (Wenger 1998). The increasing number of empirical studies on communities of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Brown and Duguid 1991; 1998; 2000; 2001; Wenger 1998; Wenger and Snyder 2000; Huysman, Wenger, and Wulf 2003; Amin and Cohendet 2004) has yielded important insights into the inner workings of these self-organizing networks that are tied together by a common interest or joint professional background. In general, this literature has stressed the complementarity of informal networks with the formal organizational networks.

Although we regard, of course, the notion of communities of practice as a very useful concept to explore learning in informal networks, previous empirical research has indicated limitations of this concept. Particularly in the highly volatile and transient organizational context of project-based industries such as the cultural industries or the software business, for example, learning takes place in a diverse range of personal networks that adhere to different social logics and display different relational architectures (Sydow and Staber 2002; Grabher 2004a; 2004b; Grabher and Ibert 2006; Obstfeld 2005; Haythornthwaite 2005). We start from the assumption that these different personal networks cannot simply be subsumed under the single notion of the community of practice. Rather we propose a differentiation of personal networks into the three distinct types of *project networks*, *sociality networks*, and *connectivity networks*. Moreover, we presume that these networks are no longer sustained by face-to-face interactions but increasingly by sophisticated combinations of various types of virtual forums.

In this paper we first elucidate some limitations of the communities of practices debates, highlight the importance of weak-tie networks for innovation processes, and suggest an increasing combination of various virtual tools into ecologies of virtual forums. Subsequently we wish to present our differentiation of personal networks along the dimensions of duration, focus, contents, and governance of ties. Finally, we sketch some research questions our research seeks to answer.

## **II Aims and approach of the study**

### **1. Moving beyond the 'community of practice'**

The notion of the 'community of practice' (Lave and Wenger 1991; Brown and Duguid 1991; 1998; 2000; 2001; Wenger 1998; Wenger and Snyder 2000; Huysman, Wenger, and Wulf 2003; Amin and Cohendet 2004) stresses the self-organizing character of networks that are tied together by a joint interest. The prime motivation for membership in these informal networks is the advancement of competencies by sharing practical experience in a rather informal setting (Wenger 1998). The organization in communities fuels knowledge creation by favoring the synergy of individual experiences shaped through heterogeneous backgrounds (see Créplet, Dupouet, and Vaast 2003: 46).

Our research aims to push the debate on knowledge production and innovation further in two directions. First, the very notion of 'community' connotes with a level of persistence, homogeneity, and familiarity that appears rather alien in the current context of a relentless reshuffling of organizational arrangements and personal affiliations. The notion of community evokes a sense of order and coherence that particularly seems absent in industries which are driven by the short cycles of temporary projects (see Lindkvist 2005). In the organizational environments of project-driven industries, organizational arrangements and personal networks are unremittingly rewired and hardly display the degree of homogeneity and harmony that the concept of very notion of 'community' evokes.

Second, the concept of community of practice is mainly presented as an informal complement to formal organizational arrangements. Communities, in other words, compensate structural shortcomings of formal organizations in capturing and distributing knowledge that is produced in the context of application. The literature on communities of practice in general "has trumpeted their positive role in organizational innovation" (Swan, Scarbrough, and Robertson 2002: 480). This celebration of communities obviously glances over that they have 'a life of their own' and indeed might be formed exactly to circumvent formal organizational arrangements and practices. We seek to appreciate that networks not only might compensate but also might compete or conflict with formal organizational arrangements (see Grabher and Ibert 2006). Conflict, in fact, might not necessarily impede innovation but rather to the contrary trigger innovative sparks or generate what Leonard-Barton (1993; 1995) calls 'creative abrasion'.

### **2. Appreciating innovation in weak-tie networks**

In a similar vein, recent debates on learning seem to privilege the 'strong tie'-end of Granovetter's (1973) paradigmatic dichotomy and use networks as a shorthand for enduring, robust, and coherent ties. Networks in this view afford the cohesive and stable social underpinnings of trust (see Noote-

boom 2000) and social capital (see Putnam 2000) that promote interactive learning and innovation processes. However, Granovetter (1973: 1366) demonstrated the elegant simplicity of the ‘strength of weak ties’: “[W]hatever is to be diffused can reach a larger number of people, and traverse greater social distance (i.e., path length), when passed through weak ties rather than strong.” Conversely, the information received in the strong-tie networks is likely to be stale information, already received from other members of the own network.

It is rather through the weak ties and sporadic contacts that cross and link different coherent social groups that new and useful information becomes available (see Constant, Sproull, and Kiesler 1996; Reagans and McEvily 2003). Weak ties can also accommodate greater cognitive distance than homogenous strong ties and thus afford important stimuli for innovation. Innovation, in other words, not only occurs from trustful collaboration but also from the confrontation with novel and unexpected perspectives (Nooteboom 2000; Grabher 2004b: 1495). Moreover, weak ties and relationships that bridge different networks afford room for arbitrage and competition and thus might fuel innovation processes (Burt [1992] 1995; 2004). We appreciate these learning dynamics by venturing into the largely neglected terrain of learning at the weak-tie end of the spectrum.

### **3. From the single technology to ecologies of virtual forums**

Our exploration of personal learning networks thirdly seeks to appreciate the increasing utilization of sophisticated virtual forums and software tools in sustaining and extending these relationships. We assume that networking, in other words, no longer is left to occasional encounters and accidental meetings but instead has become a business activity in its own right (see Wittel 2001) that more and more is supported by specialized software tools. Our approach is aimed at examining how members in networks combine the utilization of these virtual forums. In other words, we are not interested in the study of a singular communication technology. Rather we seek to shed light on the movements of network members in this rich ecology of available tools.

During the last decade, the virtual sharing of knowledge between individuals engaged in similar or dissimilar practices, in and between organizations, has attracted increasing interest (Roberts 2000; Huysman and De Wit 2002; Huysman and Van Baalen 2001; Scarbrough and Swan 2001; Zack 1999). The proliferation of the Web-based communication, without doubt, has produced a rich body of research that yielded crucial insights into the inner workings of “virtual communities” (see Rheingold 2000). However, this field of research has also attracted critique. First, by overemphasizing the role of technology as the driving force (the “ICT pitfall”; Huysman and De Wit 2002; Wegeman 2000), many studies have failed to appreciate the interdependencies between the new technological opportunities and organizational and social dimensions which shape virtual collaborative interactions (see Roberts 2000; Scarbrough and Swan 2001). A second line of critique refers to the fact that empirical research frequently focuses on the impacts of a particular new communication technology. Such a limited approach inevitably glances over the interdependencies in the increasingly complex ecology of virtual forums (see Haythornthwaite 2005: 126).

We wish to overcome these limitations. First, we seek to respond to the claims for an integrated approach to study the role of technology by appreciating the interdependencies between new tech-

nological opportunities and social dimensions of interaction (Huysman and De Wit 2002; Wegge- man 2000; see also Van den Hooff et al. 2003). This is reflected in our differentiation of personal networks. This conceptualisation combines social dimensions of networks with utilization patterns and interaction styles of the particular virtual forums that underpin these different personal networks. Second, our approach is deliberately aimed at examining how members in networks combine the utilization of different virtual forums. In other words, instead of examining a single technology, we are primarily interested in the interdependencies in the utilization of different forums in an increasingly rich ecology of available tools.

### III. The conceptual framework: a typology of personal learning networks

The basic conceptual tool for attaining our analytical objectives is a differentiation of personal networks into the three distinct types of *project networks*, *sociality networks*, and *connectivity networks*. This typology is driven by a differentiation of the duration, focus, contents, and governance of personal networks (Grabher 2004a; 2004b; Grabher and Ibert 2006; see figure 1).

Figure 1: Nature of ties in personal learning networks

Type of ties	Project networks	Sociality networks	Connectivity networks
Duration	limited (project)	lasting (biography)	sporadic (theme)
Focus	task oriented	career oriented	theme oriented
Contents	know-what	know-whom	know-how
Governance	procedural authority	networked reputation	professional ethos
Virtual forum	collaborative work- space	social networking software	weblog; online discussion forum
Virtual interaction style	synchronous and asynchronous many-to-many	asynchronous one-to-one	asynchronous one-to-many; many-to- many

#### 1. Project networks: collaborative workspaces

A project network is temporally formed around a particular project task (Goodman and Goodman 1976; Lundin and Söderholm 1995). The composition of the project team is driven by the complementarity of skills which are necessary to complete the project task. The limited duration of projects hardly allows for the evolution of enduring and strong ties (Meyerson et al. 1996), project networks rather operate in weak tie-milieu (Grabher 2004a). Project networks are governed by a common procedural authority that also defines the ‘know-what’ for the individual project member.

The project networks we study use virtual collaborative workspaces as environments for information exchange and collaboration. Interaction processes and information exchange are digitally documented in these forums and stay accessible for synchronous and asynchronous users. More specifically, we study project networks within Microsoft and SAP that utilize enterprise collaboration software for project-related communication in order to support business processes. Microsoft

SharePoint affords information sharing and shared document collaboration and meeting-specific workspaces for group appointments including communication in real-time. SAP Collaboration Room software, based on mySAP Enterprise Portal, offers information sharing; virtual project rooms for work groups or teams; news forums for all team members; and the option to navigate between different collaboration rooms.

The virtual workspaces provide the opportunity for co-present group collaboration (many-to-many). Interaction in co-presence, understood as synchronous and asynchronous communication in the same virtual environment, is an increasingly emphasized feature in the production of virtual collaboration tools (Pickering and Wynn 2004; Soroka and Jacovi 2003; Soroka, Jacovi, and Ur 2003). Co-presence is considered as an essential element of learning and problem solving processes. We suppose that the role of co-presence in strengthening interpersonal ties cannot fully be substituted by virtual forms of interaction which do not take place in shared face-to-face environments (as emphasized in the concepts of “meetingness”, for example, Urry 2003).

We selected SAP and Microsoft project networks since they not only represent most influential precursors in the development of the respective tools and techniques but also permanently reflect the adoption and use of these technologies in a systematic way. Studying virtual collaboration systems in the dominant enterprise software companies thus not only yields insights into the use of established cutting edge technologies (see Pickering and Wynn 2004). Moreover, our focus on SAP and Microsoft project networks provides insights into major future trends and trajectories in the development of team-based learning tools for distributed actors.

## **2. Sociality networks: social networking software**

We conceive sociality networks as career-oriented relationships. Whereas project networks are focused on a particular task, the prime aim of sociality networks is to widen the individual personal networks, that is to acquire the ‘know-whom’ to approach for referrals, for inquiring up-coming jobs or potential business opportunities. Sociality networks are tied together by lasting relationships that are aimed at supporting the personal professional biography. In the absence of personal experience with a particular person or firm, network members rely on networked reputation, that is basically the word-of-mouth judgments of friends-of-friends (Granovetter 1985: 490; Glückler and Armbruster 2003). Whereas project and connectivity networks are relatively distant from the private realm, sociality networks instrumentalize the private dimension of relationships (such as personal sympathy or joint acquaintances) to advance professional interests.

This sort of networking amalgamates professional and private facets and can potentially be enhanced by the use of social networking software (like LinkedIn or Spoke). Social networking software systematizes the maintenance and extension of personal networks through electronic contact management. Social networking software compiles strategic information on corporations and the career of individual network members by Web crawling and the use of information which is accessible through the software users’ personal networks. The friend-of-friend principle, that is Granovetter’s (1985) proverbial “weak ties”, enables to electronically trace a link from a user who intends to address a targeted person through his own personal network. Sociality networks are char-

acterized by asynchronous one-to-one interactions and communication is taking place through relational chains (i.e. the forwarding of requests through network members).

The number of users using the second generation of social networking-ware grows exponentially since 2002. Few academic studies have been conducted on the use of social networking software so far (for exceptions, see studies by the Sociable Media Group, Media Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Donath and Boyd 2004; and the Information Management Section of the University of California, Berkeley: Boyd 2004). Discussion on products and the utilization of social networking software is to date mostly taking place in weblogs and white papers of software companies (e.g. Akella, Interrante, and Granovetter 2004). The proposed research will analyze interaction logics based on two of the most influential software products for professional networking: LinkedIn and Spoke. These two are selected on the basis of their relatively high sophistication regarding privacy issues. This contributes to the attractiveness of LinkedIn and Spoke for users since information about the personal network is regarded a rather confidential issue.

### **3. Connectivity networks: weblogs and online discussion forums**

We construe connectivity networks as theme-oriented networks characterized by sporadic interaction. Whereas sociality networks are about accumulating the ‘know-whom’ of personal contacts and referrals, connectivity networks are all about sharing ‘know-how’ and specific information around a particular theme, a specific software like Linux, for example. Since this exchange of know-how and collaborative problem solving is distant from the personal realm, the socially rather thin connectivity networks are primarily governed by the particular professional norms and ethos (see also Orlikowski 2002: 264; Brenner 2003). Easy access to information is decisive for the ephemeral and weak-tie character of connectivity networks.

We first analyze connectivity networks formed by developer weblogs hosted by Microsoft and SAP experts. These weblogs are integral parts of the Web-based Microsoft and SAP developer community portals and are accessible on the community websites. “Weblogs, or blogs for short, are frequently updated websites, with relatively short time-stamped posts, most recent on top. They are highly cited with links to source material” (Rodi 2004: 1). Weblogs are theme-oriented discussion forums hosted by one or more persons. Distributed discussants accessing the site can post answers or comments. The second type of connectivity networks we analyze are UseNet online discussion forums for software developers. Whereas discussion topics and contributions to weblogs are administered by the person(s) who host(s) them, group discussion forums sustain the collective ownership and control of contents. Contributions either remain uncensored, or they are reviewed by a moderator often appointed by the group. In contrast to weblogs which thus represent a hierarchic definition of content development, online group discussion forums illustrate a heterarchic regulation of thematic contributions and group dynamics. Connectivity networks are consequently shaped by collaborative asynchronous one-to-many or many-to-many interactions.

These network types, of course, neither signify ‘arithmomorphic’ concepts with sharp boundaries nor do they remain unchanged over time. In fact, they more typically overlap and alter their character over time. We assume members in sociality and connectivity networks collaboratively produce

different types of knowledge that are instrumental for the project networks formally established around a particular task. Cross-network movements from connectivity networks to project networks might take place due to theme-related expertise obtained through connectivity network interactions. Networked reputation established within sociality networks can lead to involvement in project networks. Conversely actors involved in project networks might join specific sociality and connectivity networks.

#### **IV. Expected contributions: key research questions and hypotheses**

This research will provide an empirically robust differentiation of personal learning networks. The differentiation between project, sociality, and connectivity networks will yield insights into the inner workings, the relational architectures, and the specific contribution of these networks to the production of different types of knowledge. We especially focus on strategic behavior patterns in the negotiations of information and services. We assume that the three types of networks convey three different types of strategic knowledges, know-what, know-how, and know-whom. In addition to observing the combination and recombination processes of these types of information, we focus on their implementation through linked persons. Especially in the case of sociality networks, strategic information translates as information about people, their experiences, and their availability for the implementation of ideas. We also examine the overlap and the movement of information and members between the different types of networks. Moreover, this research is expected to provide patterns of the utilization of virtual forums to sustain these networks.

More specifically, we expect that our research will provide empirical material to evaluate the following hypotheses.

(1) The strategic use of contacts can electronically be enhanced by means of social networking software in professional networking. When using contacts in this systemized form, the number of contacts in the individual network rises, whereas the nature of ties becomes less personal and reliable (see Donath and Boyd 2004: 78-80; Boyd 2004: 2).

(2) Rich get richer (Powell et al. 2005: 1137), poor stay poor. Personal connections are multipliers of connections in two respects:

(2.1) The more influential the position of an individual in a network (as documented in strategic positions and the quantity of ties), the higher the preferential attachment of others to this person's network (see Powell et al. 2005: 1137).

(2.2) Individuals without a sufficient contact base that they can feed into their contact management software, or who are not prepared to systematically develop their network, will lose their networked reputation.

(3) Social networking software leads to an increase in the amount of time spent for personal networking (see Donath and Boyd 2004: 81). Electronic communication forums in general lead to an enhanced time span dedicated to personal networking in comparison to face-to-face interaction patterns.

(4) Although especially virtual co-presence is an important factor in rationalizing work flow processes and significantly reduces the time spent for face-to-face encounters, it cannot completely substitute face-to-face meetings in building up reliable ties (see Urry 2003: 171; Maskell, Bathelt, and

Malmberg 2004). We assume face-to-face and virtual co-presence to mutually reinforce each other in terms of intensifying personal relations.

(5) Sociality and connectivity networks as self-organized and informal webs can only to a certain degree be integrated into formal processes of knowledge production. Strategic instrumentalization will undermine the innovative potential of networks that are based on an ethos of informal self-organization (see Swan, Scarbrough, and Robertson 2002; on the role of autonomy and identity of communities, see Dibiaggio 1998; Wenger 1998).

(6) We expect the observed networks to overlap in network activities (see Østerlund and Carlile 2003). We assume sociality and connectivity networks provide potential actor constellations for future project networks. Members of project networks on their part will strategically use sociality and connectivity networks for extending their know-whom and know-how (see DeFillippi and Arthur 1998; Sydow and Staber 2002).

(7) The personal learning networks overlap and mutually support each other, but we expect that they also generate tensions and conflicts (see Ibert 2004: section 5). In particular members will maintain sociality and connectivity networks at the expense of project networks (see Alvesson 2000).

(8) The conceptual designs of the social software supporting the three types of learning networks predetermine the structural development of personal networks. In the case of software for professional networking for instance, structure affects agency through the logic of connection chains. A user can exclusively contact targeted individuals through her personal connections. Similarly, the growth of the personal network can only unfold in connections which serve as multipliers of new connections. This conceptual design thus predetermines the trajectories of the evolution of personal networks.

## References

- Akella, P., Interrante, M., Granovetter, M. (2004).** "Selling the Spoke way." Spoke white paper. Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW 2004). Chicago, Illinois: ACM, 6-10 November 2004.
- Alvesson, M. (2000).** "Social identity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge intensive companies." *Journal of Management Studies* 37(8): 1101-1123.
- Amin, A., Cohendet, P. (2004).** *Architectures of knowledge. Firms, capabilities, and communities.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Boyd, D. M. (2004).** "Friendster and publicly articulated social networking." Conference on Human Factors and Computing Systems (CHI 2004). Vienna: ACM, 24-29 April 2004: 1-5.
- Brenner, C. (2003).** "Learning communities in a learning region: The soft infrastructure of cross-firm learning networks in Silicon Valley." *Environment and Planning A* 35(10): 1809-1830.
- Brown, J.S., Duguid, P. (1991).** "Organizational learning and communities of practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning and innovation." *Organization Science* 2(1): 40-57.
- Brown, J.S., Duguid, P. (1998).** "Organizing knowledge." *California Management Review* 40(3): 90-111.
- Brown, J.S., Duguid, P. (2000).** *The social life of information.* Boston, Harvard Business School Press.

- Brown, J.S., Duguid, P. (2001).** "Knowledge and organization: A social-practice perspective." *Organization Science* 12(2): 198-213.
- Burt, R.S. ([1992] 1995).** *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA, London, Harvard University Press.
- Burt, R.S. (2004).** "Structural holes and good ideas." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(2): 349-399.
- Constant, D., Sproull, L., Kiesler, S. (1996).** "The kindness of strangers: On the usefulness of weak ties for technical advice." *Organization Science* 7: 119-135.
- Créplet, F., Dupouet, O., Vaast, E. (2003).** Episteme or practice? Differentiated communitarian structures in a biology laboratory. In M. Huysman, E. Wenger and V. Wulf (eds.) *Communities and technologies*. Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 43-63.
- DeFillippi, R.J., Arthur, M.B. (1998).** "Paradox in project-based enterprise: The case of film making." *California Management Review* 40(2): 125-138.
- Dibiaggio, L. (1998).** *Information, connaissance et organisation*. PhD Thesis, Université Nice - Sophia Antipolis, Faculté de Droit, de Sciences Economiques et de Gestion.
- Donath, J., Boyd, D. M. (2004).** "Public displays of connection." *BT Technology Journal* 22(4): 71-82.
- Glückler, J., Armbruster, T. (2003).** "Bridging uncertainty in management consulting: The mechanisms of trust and networked reputation." *Organization Studies* 24(2): 269-297.
- Goodman, R.A., Goodman, L.P. (1976).** "Some management issues in temporary systems: A study of professional development and manpower – the theatre case." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21(3): 494-501.
- Grabher, G. (2004a).** "Learning in projects, remembering in networks? Communitarianity, sociality and connectivity in project ecologies." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 11(2): 103-123.
- Grabher, G. (2004b).** "Temporary architectures of learning. Knowledge governance in project ecologies." *Organization Studies* 25(9): 1491-1514.
- Grabher, G., Ibert, O. (2006).** "Bad company? The ambiguity of personal knowledge networks." *Journal of Economic Geography*, forthcoming.
- Granovetter, M. (1973).** "The strength of weak ties." *American Journal of Sociology* 78(6): 1360-1380.
- Granovetter, M. (1985).** "Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3): 481-501.
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005).** "Social networks and Internet connectivity effects." *Information, Communication & Society* 8(2): 125-147.
- Huysman, M., de Wit, D. (2002).** *Knowledge sharing in practice*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Huysman, M., Van Baalen, P. (Eds.). (2001).** *Trends in communication. Special issue on Communities of practice*. Amsterdam, Boom: 7-20.
- Huysman, M., Wenger, E., Wulf, V. (Eds.). (2003).** *Communities and technologies*. Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ibert, O. (2004).** "Projects and firms as discordant complements: Organizational learning in the Munich software ecology." *Research Policy* 33(10): 1529-1546.

- Lave, J., Wenger, E. (1991).** *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1993).** "Developer-user interaction, and user satisfaction in internal technology transfer." *Academy of Management Journal* 36(5): 1125-1139.
- Leonard-Barton, D. (1995).** *Wellsprings of knowledge-building and sustaining the sources of innovation*. Boston, MA, Harvard Business School Press.
- Lindkvist, L. (2005).** "Knowledge communities and knowledge collectivities: A typology of knowledge work in groups." *Journal of Management Studies* 42(6): 1189-1210.
- Lundin, R. A., Söderholm, A. (1995).** "A theory of the temporary organization." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 11(4): 437-455.
- Maskell, P., Bathelt, H., Malmberg, A. (2004).** "Temporary clusters and knowledge creation: The effects of international trade fairs, conventions and other professional gatherings." *Spatial Aspects Concerning Economic Studies* 4. Marburg, Philipps-University of Marburg.
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E., Kramer, R. M. (1996).** Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. M. Kramer and T. R. Tyler (eds.) *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage: 166-195.
- Nooteboom, B. (2000).** "Learning by interaction: Absorptive capacity, cognitive distance and governance." *Journal of Management and Governance* 4: 69-92.
- Obstfeld, D. (2005).** "Social networks, the *tertius iungens* orientation, and involvement in innovation." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50: 100-130.
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2002).** "Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing." *Organization Science* 13(3): 249-273.
- Østerlund, C., Carlile, P. (2003).** How practice matters: A relational view of knowledge sharing. In M. Huysman, E. Wenger and V. Wulf (eds.) *Communities and technologies*. Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 1-22.
- Pickering, C., Wynn, E. (2004).** "An architecture and business process framework for global team collaboration." *Intel Technology Journal* 8(4): 373-382.
- Powell, W.W., White, D.R., Koput, K.W., Owen-Smith, J. (2005).** "Network dynamics and field evolution: The growth of interorganizational collaboration in the life sciences." *American Journal of Sociology* 110(4): 1132-1205.
- Putnam, R.D. (2000).** *Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, Simon and Schuster.
- Reagans, R., McEvily, B. (2003).** "Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28: 240-267.
- Rheingold, H. (2000).** *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Roberts, J. (2000).** "From know-how to show-how? Questioning the role of information and communication technologies in knowledge transfer." *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 12(4): 429-443.
- Rodi, C. (2004).** "The Blogs are a Comin'." [http://redon.crew.umich.edu/si684/incoming/Paper\\_on\\_blogs6353.pdf](http://redon.crew.umich.edu/si684/incoming/Paper_on_blogs6353.pdf), access: 1 December 2004.

- Scarbrough, H., Swan, J. (2001).** Knowledge communities and innovation. In M. Huysman and P. Van Baalen (eds.) *Trends in Communication; Special issue on Communities of practice*. Amsterdam, Boom: 7-20.
- Soroka, V., Jacovi, M. (2003).** "The place for reaching out". ECSCW 2003 Workshop on Inhabiting Virtual Places: Social Context in Online Work Places.
- Soroka, V., Jacovi, M., Ur, S. (2003).** We can see you: A study of communities' invisible people through ReachOut. In M. Huysman, E. Wenger and V. Wulf (eds.) *Communities and technologies*. Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 65-79.
- Swan, J., Scarbrough, H., Robertson, M. (2002).** "The construction of 'communities of practice' in the management of innovation." *Management Learning* 33(4): 477-496.
- Sydow, J., Staber, U. (2002).** "The institutional embeddedness of project networks: The case of content production in German television." In G. Grabher (ed.) *Production in projects: Economic geographies of temporary collaboration. Regional Studies Special Issue* 36(3): 215-227.
- Urry, J. (2003).** "Social networks, travel and talk." *British Journal of Sociology* 54(2): 155-175.
- Van den Hooff, B., Elving, W., Meeuwssen, J.M., Dumoulin, C. (2003).** Knowledge sharing in knowledge communities. In M. Huysman, E. Wenger and V. Wulf (eds.) *Communities and technologies*. Dordrecht, Boston, London, Kluwer Academic Publishers: 119-141.
- Weggeman, M. (2000).** *Kenntnismanagement: de praktijk (Knowledge Management: Practice)*. Schiedam, Scriptum Management.
- Wenger, E. (1998).** *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., Snyder, W.M. (2000).** "Communities of practice: The organizational frontier." *Harvard University Review* Jan-Feb: 139-145.
- Wittel, A. (2001).** "Towards a network sociality." *Theory, Culture & Society* 18 (6): 51-76.
- Zack, M.H. (1999).** "Managing codified knowledge." *Sloan Management Review*, summer 1999.