

Chapter 5.5

Governance Mechanisms for E–Collaboration

Anupam Ghosh

ICFAI Institute for Management Teachers, India

Jane Fedorowicz

Bentley College, USA

INTRODUCTION

E-collaboration, defined as “collaboration among individuals engaged in a common task using electronic technologies” (Kock, Davison, Ocker, & Wazlawick, 2001), is increasingly gaining relevance at the interorganizational level because of the growing practice of working with dispersed project teams across the globe. E-collaboration links together partners on projects and business processes that cross legal boundaries, as is the case, for example, in supply chains and in product lifecycle management (PLM) teams. General purpose computer-based collaboration tools like the Internet, e-mails, instant messaging, discussion boards, groupware, portals, blogs, and wikis are commonly used for e-collaboration (Fichter, 2005), while task-specific tools exist for many interorganizational activities such as PLM or collaborative planning, forecasting, and replenishment (CPFR).

A primary purpose of interorganizational e-collaboration is sharing of information among business partners to attain predetermined objectives. However, sharing information can be risky as other partners in the relationship may behave opportunistically, having gained access to sensitive information or intellectual property. To facilitate information sharing and succeed in e-collaboration, firms engaged in partnerships need to agree on a common governance mechanism—a set of responses to conditions of uncertainty, dependence, and opportunism that exists in a business relationship (Alvarez, Barney, & Douglas, 2003; Heide, 1994). Trust, bargaining power, and contracts are three important governance mechanisms that shape interorganizational relationships and operational performance (Alvarez et al., 2003).

This article discusses the role of these three governance mechanisms (trust, bargaining power, and contracts) in support of information sharing

in an e-collaboration environment. The operational performance of a collaborative team will be dependent on how effectively the members in the team share information and coordinate their activities. To allay the fears associated with sharing sensitive information, firms participating in the collaborative effort can manage their business relationships by introducing appropriate governance mechanisms. The following sections will describe the three governance mechanisms and discuss the interdependencies among them.

BACKGROUND

Information Sharing

Sharing information enables partners to integrate shared activities and improve their collective performance (Lee, Padmanabhan, & Whang, 1997; Lee & Whang, 2000; Simatupang & Sridharan, 2002; Yu, Yan, & Chang, 2001). Information sharing leads to many real benefits within a relationship. For example, in a supply chain setting, it can help to reduce the bullwhip effect, cut stock levels, reduce the cash conversion cycle, help to locate weak partners in the chain, provide cost savings, utilize unused capacity of other chain partners, enable risk taking and postponement, and so forth (Lee et al., 1997; Yang, Burns, & Backhouse, 2005). There are many attributes of information that must be considered when partners determine the nature and quality of a relationship. These attributes tend to have a dramatic impact on the ability of the collaboration to succeed in their cooperative effort. These attributes include: accuracy, understandability, relevance, timeliness, accessibility, completeness, appropriate amount, reliability, ease of use, degree of electronic integration, mode of data transfer, frequency of information sharing, and the cost of sharing information (Davis, 1989; Epstein & King, 1982; Fedorowicz & Lee, 1998-99; Gendron, Shanks,

& Alampi, 2004; Wang & Strong, 1996; Zahedi, Pelt, & Song, 2001).

In addition to ensuring that the information being shared itself meets the needs of the individuals and organizations on a project team, those setting up a relationship must also manage the inherent risks associated with sharing information (Handfield & Bechtel, 2002). These risks include the potential for losing control over strategic information, identifying others' weaknesses, sharing competitive data, and using information to interfere with others' business processes.

To reduce such risks and succeed in information sharing, firms in the partnership need to agree on a common governance mechanism that will direct their relationship. Interfirm governance mechanisms, considered collectively, serve as a strategic response to conditions of uncertainty and dependence that exist in any business relationship and work towards reducing the threat of opportunism in an exchange (Alvarez et al., 2003; Heide, 1994). The presence of governance mechanisms in interorganizational partnerships also positively affects their collective performance (Dyer, 1996; Saxton, 1997; Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1998; Wathney & Heide, 2004). Such mechanisms are used for initiating, maintaining, and terminating business relationships (Heide, 1994). We will discuss three types of governance mechanisms in the remainder of this article. These are trust, bargaining power, and contracts (Alvarez et al., 2003; Dyer, 1996; Dyer & Chu, 2003).

Trust

Trust provides a foundation for collaboration (Kramer, 1999; Komiak & Benbasat, 2004; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998) and is an important factor in determining the success of many business relationships (Jones & George, 1998; Paul & McDaniel, 2004; Scheer & Stern, 1992). Trust is defined as a psychological state that rests upon the expectations and beliefs of one party that

5 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/governance-mechanisms-collaboration/8839

Related Content

Classification of English Educational Resources Information Based on Mobile Learning Using Cognitive Web Service

Lilin Liu (2023). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 1-19).

www.irma-international.org/article/classification-of-english-educational-resources-information-based-on-mobile-learning-using-cognitive-web-service/316657

Coronavirus Pandemic Open Distance E-Learning (ODEL) as an Alternative Strategy for Higher Educational Institutions

Oluwole Oluhide Durodolu, Rexwhite Enakrire, Chisita, Takaingenhamo Chisitaand Vusi W. Tsabedze (2023). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 1-10).

www.irma-international.org/article/coronavirus-pandemic-open-distance-e-learning-odel-as-an-alternative-strategy-for-higher-educational-institutions/315785

Indicator Modelling and Interactive Visualisation for Urban Sustainability Assessment

Ruth E. Falconer, John P. Isaacs, Daniel Gilmourand David J. Blackwood (2018). *E-Planning and Collaboration: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 486-508).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/indicator-modelling-and-interactive-visualisation-for-urban-sustainability-assessment/206018

Designing for Creativity in Computer-Supported Cooperative Work

Umer Farooq, John M. Carrolland Craig Ganoë (2010). *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on E-Collaboration: Emerging Trends and Applications* (pp. 142-161).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/designing-creativity-computer-supported-cooperative/41548

The Virtual Individual Education Plan (IEP) Team: Using Online Collaboration to Develop a Behavior Intervention Plan

Robyn M. Catagnusand Donald A. Hantula (2013). *Interdisciplinary Applications of Electronic Collaboration Approaches and Technologies* (pp. 30-45).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-individual-education-plan-iep/68602