

## **SMEs: ERP or Virtual Collaboration Teams**

**<sup>1</sup>Nader Ale Ebrahim, Shamsuddin Ahmed, Zahari Taha**

**Department of Engineering Design and Manufacture, Faculty of Engineering**

**University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia**

**<sup>1</sup>aleebrahim@perdana.um.edu.my**

### **Abstract**

Small firms are indeed the engines of global economic growth. Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) play an important role to promote economic development. SMEs in the beginning of implementing new technologies always face capital shortage and need technological assistance. Available ERP systems do not fulfil the specific requirements of Small firms. SMEs has scarce resources and manpower therefore many SMEs don't have the possessions to buy and operate an ERP System. On the other hand competition and competitiveness of SMEs have to be strengthened. This paper briefly reviews the existing perspectives on virtual teams and their effect on SMEs management. It also discusses the main characteristics of virtual teams and clarifies the differences aspects of virtual team application in SMEs. After outlining some of the main advantages and pitfall of such teams, it concentrates on comparing of ERP and virtual collaborative teams in SMEs. Finally, it provides evidence for the need of "Software as a Service (SaaS)" where an application is hosted as a service provided to customers across the web for SMEs as an alternative of ERP. It has been widely argued that ERP disadvantage in SMEs such as administrative expenditure and cost, isolated structure, severe lack of software flexibility, insufficient support of SMEs business and high operating cost, lead SMEs to use virtual collaborative team which is net work base solution.

### **Keywords**

Virtual teams, Small and medium enterprises, ERP, Collaboration

## **Introduction**

SMEs are a major part of the industrial economies [1, 2]. Their survival and growth has therefore been a prominent issue. Beck et al.[3] found that a strong, positive association between the importance of SMEs and GDP per capita growth. SMEs can successfully enter the global market if they can fulfill the customer needs regarding features and quality of products [4]. SMEs' survival depended on their capability to improve their performance and produce goods that could meet international standards [5]. In other words, a certain level of competitiveness may be a prerequisite for an SME's survival when dealing with dynamic conditions in the business environment. To compete with global competition and, overcome rapid technology change and product variety proliferation in the new manufacturing environment, SMEs must be able to sustain product innovation [6]. Internationalization holds much potential for the growth of SMEs [7]. One very important trend to enable new knowledge creation and transfer in and to SME's is the development of collaborative environments and networks to increase their innovation capabilities as a single unit but also the capabilities of the network as a whole through collective learning [8]. The SMEs are one of the sectors that have a strong potential to benefit from advances in ICTs and the adaptation of new business modes of operation.

The combination of explosive knowledge growth and inexpensive information transfer creates a fertile soil for unlimited virtually invention [9]. The use of ICTs can be considered as key factors for innovation and entrepreneurship. ICTs are a must for SMEs to innovate [10]. Web resource services can help the enterprises to get external service resources and implement collaborative design and manufacturing [11]. ERP has administrative expenditure and cost, isolated structure, severe lack of software flexibility, insufficient support of SMEs business and high operating cost as a consequence SMEs lead to use virtual collaborative team which is net work base solution. In different point of view international collaboration is becoming increasingly important in creating the knowledge that makes research and business more competitive. Responding to the increasing de-centralization and globalization of work processes, many organizations have responded to their dynamic environments by introducing virtual teams. Virtual teams are growing in popularity [12]. Additionally, the rapid development of new communication technologies such as the Internet has accelerated this trend so that today, most of the larger organization employs virtual teams to some degree [13].

This paper briefly reviews and summaries the key finding of the existing perspectives on virtual teams and their effect on SMEs. It also discusses the main characteristics of SMEs, virtual teams and clarifies the differences aspects of virtual team application in SMEs. After outlining some of the main advantages and pitfall of such teams, it concentrates on comparing of ERP and virtual collaborative teams in SMEs. This paper would help researchers, managers and policy makers to better foster virtual teams in SMEs.

## **Virtual Teams**

The concept of a "team" is described as a small number of people with complementary skills who are equally committed to a common purpose, goals, and working approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable [14]. It is worth mentioning that virtual teams are often formed to overcome geographical or temporal separations [15]. Virtual teams work across boundaries of time and space by utilizing modern computer-driven technologies. The term "virtual team" is used to cover a wide range of activities and forms of technology-supported working [16]. Gassmann and Von Zedtwitz [17] defined "virtual team as a group of people and sub-teams who interact through interdependent tasks guided by common purpose and work across links strengthened by information, communication, and transport

technologies.” Another definition suggests that virtual teams, are distributed work teams whose members are geographically dispersed and coordinate their work predominantly with electronic information and communication technologies (e-mail, video-conferencing, telephone, etc.) [13], different authors have identified diverse. Amongst the different definitions of the concept of a virtual team the following from is one of the most widely accepted: [18], “virtual teams as groups of geographically, organizationally and/or time dispersed workers brought together by information technologies to accomplish one or more organization tasks”.

#### *Characteristics of virtual teams:*

Virtual teams reduce time-to-market [4, 19-28]. Lead time or time to market has been generally admitted to be one of the most important keys for success in manufacturing companies [20]. Time also has an almost 1:1 correlation with cost, so cost will likewise be reduced if the time-to market is quicker [29]. Virtual teams overcome the limitations of time, space, and organizational affiliation that traditional teams face [30] and reducing relocation time and costs, reduced travel costs [21, 31-39]. Virtual teams overcome the limitations of time, space, and organizational affiliation that traditional teams face [30]. One of the most important of employ virtual R&D team is able to tap selectively into center of excellence, using the best talent regardless of location [12, 34, 35, 40-44].

Virtual team also, respond quickly to changing business environments [25, 33], able to digitally or electronically unite experts in highly specialized fields working at great distances from each other [45], more effective R&D continuation decisions [46], most effective in making decisions [47, 48], provide greater degree of freedom to individuals involved with the development project [35, 43, 49], Greater productivity, shorter development times [25, 31], Producing better outcomes and attract better employees, Generate the greatest competitive advantage from limited resources [32, 50, 51], Useful for projects that require cross-functional or cross boundary skilled inputs [52], Less resistant to change [53], Facilitating transnational innovation processes [17, 35], higher degree of cohesion (Teams can be organized whether or not members are in proximity to one another) [54, 55], Evolving organizations from production-oriented to service/information-oriented [53] and Provide organizations with unprecedented level of flexibility and responsiveness [18, 22, 26, 30, 39, 56]. Beside these advantages virtual teams are self-assessed performance and high performance[57, 58], employees perform their work without concern of space or time constraints[59], optimize the contributions of individual members toward the completion of business tasks and organizational goal [41], reduce the pollution [60], manage the development and commercialization tasks quite well [61], Improve communication and coordination, and encourage the mutual sharing of inter-organizational resources and competencies [62], employees can more easily accommodate both personal and professional lives [12], cultivating and managing creativity [43, 63, 64], facilitate knowledge capture and sharing knowledge, experiences [28, 42, 45, 65], Improve the detail and precision of design activities [66], Provide a vehicle for global collaboration and coordination of R&D-related activities [67], Allow organizations to access the most qualified individuals for a particular job regardless of their location[56] and Enable organizations to respond faster to increased competition[56, 68].The ratio of virtual R&D member publications exceeded from co-located publications[69] and the extent of informal exchange of information is minimal [70, 71]. Virtual teams have better team outcomes (quality, productivity, and satisfaction) [30, 55, 72], Reduce training expenses, faster learning[43, 64] and finally greater client satisfaction[73].

As a drawback, virtual teams are particularly vulnerable to mistrust, communication break downs, conflicts, and power struggles [45, 74-76]. Sometimes requires complex technological applications[33, 43] and have lack of physical interaction [21, 32, 47]. Virtual teams comprise challenges of project management [43, 77, 78], determining the appropriate task technology fit [43, 79-81], managing conflict [30, 79, 82, 83] and technophobia ( employees who are uncomfortable with computer and other

telecommunications technologies) [60]. Cultural and functional diversity in virtual teams lead to differences in the members thought processes therefore develop trust among the members are challenging [21, 43, 58, 67, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85]. Variety of practices (cultural and work process diversity) and employee mobility negatively impacted performance in virtual teams[57] and Team members need special training and encouragement [86].

### **Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs):**

#### *Importance of SMEs:*

Acs, et al.[87] argued that small firms are indeed the engines of global economic growth. Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) play an important role to promote economic development. SMEs in the beginning of R&D activities always face capital shortage and need technological assistance. In most countries, SMEs dominate the industrial and commercial infrastructure [88]. More importantly SMEs play an important role in foreign direct investment (FDI) [89]. Many economists believe that the wealth of nations and the growth of their economies strongly depend upon their SMEs' performance [90]. In many developed and developing countries, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are the unsung heroes that bring stability to the national economy. They help buffer the shocks that come with the boom and bust of economic cycles. SMEs also serve as the key engine behind equalizing income disparity among workers [91]. China's recent rapid growth is also linked to the emergence of many new small firms in village townships and in coastal areas, often in new industries [87].

#### *SMEs and Virtual Teams:*

To survive in the global economy SMEs have to improve their products and processes exploiting their intellectual capital in a dynamic network of knowledge-intensive relations inside and outside their borders[92]. SMEs need appropriate and up-to-date knowledge in order to compete and there is a strong need to create, share and disseminate knowledge within SME's [93]. Especially in the emerging and dynamic markets the shared knowledge creation and innovation may speed up market development [94]. Most firms today do not operate alone; they are networked vertically with many value-chain partners [9]. The typical Taiwanese production system is a cooperative network of SMEs that are extremely flexible and respond quickly though under-capitalized and sensitive to market demand and highly integrated in the global economy [95]. Strategic alliance formation has been touted as one of the most critical strategic actions that SMEs must undertake for survival and success [96]. Gassmann and Keupp [97]found that managers of SMEs should invest less in tangible assets, but more in those areas such as R&D that will directly generate their future competitive advantage.

#### *Virtual teams in SMEs*

Most SMEs are heavily reliant on external sources, including customers and suppliers, for the generation of new knowledge [98]. SMEs of all sizes must reach out into their external environment for necessary resources [96]. In the present era of globalization it is obvious that the survival of the SMEs will be determined first and foremost by their ability to manufacture/supply more, at competitive cost, in less delivery time, with minimum defects, using fewer resources [99]. In order to face this challenge SMEs reinforce to create synergies that allow firms to overcome difficulties and succeed. Web resource services can help the enterprises to get external service resources and implement collaborative design and manufacturing [11].

## The Major Characteristics of SMEs

In order to have a better understanding of SMEs behavior, a brief knowledge of the characteristics of SMEs is a must therefore the major characteristics of SMEs are listed in the Table 1 and Table 2 (These are generalizations, and not all may hold true for every SMEs.). The SME is not a scaled-down version of a large company. It has different characteristics that distinguish them from large corporations and that can of course change across different countries and cultures; they are generally independent, multi-tasking, cash-limited and based on personal relationships and informality, as well as actively managed by the owners, highly personalized, largely local in their area of operation and largely dependent on internal sources to finance growth [100].

Table 1: some of the major advantages of SMEs

Advantages	Reference
Generally dominated by the entrepreneur (owner-manager)	[98, 101-105]
Able to respond quickly to customer requests and market changes, Customers focused	[98, 101, 106-109]
Flexible and fast-response to change, easily adaptive to new market conditions, dynamic in behavior, developing customized solutions for partners and customers	[88, 101, 110-115].
Concentrated production and sales in their home country	[100, 110].
More extensive use of external linkages for Innovate.	[116, 117]
Un bureaucratic processes, flat and flexible structures	[88, 99, 101, 118-121]
Strong inter and intra-firm relationships, managing a great amount of information	[122, 123]
Creating astute alliances, networking	[121, 124-126]

Table 2: some of the major disadvantages of SMEs

Disadvantages	Reference
Scarce resources and manpower	[6, 7, 88, 111, 112, 120, 124, 126-134]
limited degree of information technology (IT) implementation	[2, 92, 99, 102, 105, 127, 135]
Strategy formulation on the basis of what available, lack a long run perspective	[5, 134]
Rely on outdated technology, labor intensive and traditional management practices	[3, 88, 130]
Lagging in the export, lack the resources necessary to enter foreign markets	[132, 136]

## ERP or Web Base Collaborative

The internet, incorporating computers and multimedia, has provided tremendous potential for remote integration and collaboration in business and manufacturing applications [137]. A web-based collaborative product design platform enables authorized users in geographically different locations to have access to the company's product data such as product drawing files stored at designated servers and carry out product design work simultaneously and collaboratively on any operating systems [138]. It is hard to allocate funding and to design infrastructures and software to support virtual team working [57]. Despite computers' widespread use for personal applications, very few programming frameworks exist for creating synchronous collaborative applications [139]. The integrated system can effectively support a dispersed team [140].

New trend in software will have full-fledged “Software as a Service (SaaS)” where an application is hosted as a service provided to customers across the web. Software as a Service reduce implementation barriers common to smaller manufacturing by offering low total cost of ownership, fast and easy adaptation and lower barriers to entry because of SaaS need fewer IT resources. Compare with ERP disadvantage such as administrative expenditure and cost, isolated structure, severe lack of software flexibility, insufficient support of SMEs business and high operating cost, SMEs willing to use SaaS and virtual collaborative team which is net work base solution. On the other hand Kohand and Simpson[141] argued that ERP systems could create a competitive advantage for SMEs.

## Conclusion

It has been widely argued that ERP disadvantage in SMEs such as administrative expenditure and cost, severe lack of software flexibility, insufficient support of SMEs business and high operating cost, lead SMEs to use virtual collaborative team. The employed Web Services technology, although very popular nowadays but it is still not mature enough, so dealing with it can bring new findings. A comprehensive study, combining literature survey with case study would now seem to be essential to examine ERP and virtuality solution and compare them practically. Such a study would provide an assessing what patterns, practices, or types of activities must SMEs virtual teams carry out to achieve effective growth?, What types of process structure and technology support should be provided for facilitating such teams? , What different Methods of virtual team in SME's are uses today and how effective are they? and What benefits and problems arise as a consequence of the creation of virtual team in SMEs or extending the ERP system?

While some studies have been conducted on model usage in large companies, applications within SMEs remain largely un-documented. Evidence shows management of virtual team in SMEs is largely in its infancy. Hence it is vital to bridge this gap and unlock growth opportunities for SMEs through research, and help them carry out or outsource research in order to develop new technology based products, processes and services, exploit research results, acquire technological know-how and train their employees to incorporate SMEs. Implementing a new paradigm has a major obstacle ahead therefore setting-up an infrastructure for virtual team in SMEs still requires a large engineering effort especially design a proper Web base collaborative system and a series of SaaS in preference to ERP.

## References

1. Robles-Estrada, C. and M. Gómez-Suárez. *E-Business Adoption in the SME's: towards an Integrated Theoretical-Empirical Research Framework*. in *The 10th International Conference on Global Business & Economic Development , Creativity & Innovation: Imperatives for Global Business and Development*. 2007. Ryukoku University Fukakusa Campus, Kyoto, Japan.
2. Eikebrokk, T.R. and D.H. Olsen, *An empirical investigation of competency factors affecting e-business success in European SMEs*. Information & Management, 2007. **44**(4): p. 364-383
3. Beck, T., A. Demircuc-Kunt, and R. Levine, *SMEs, Growth, and Poverty: Cross-Country Evidence*. Journal of Economic Growth 2005. **10**(3): p. 199-229.
4. Kusar, J., et al., *How to reduce new product development time*. Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing 2004. **20**: p. 1-15.
5. Gomez, J.O. and M. Simpson, *Achieving competitive advantage in the Mexican footwear industry. Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 2007. **14**(3): p. 289-305.
6. Laforet, S., *Size, strategic, and market orientation affects on innovation*. Journal of Business Research (Article in press), 2007.

7. Lu, J.W. and P.W. Beamish, *SME internationalization and performance: Growth vs. profitability*. Journal of International Entrepreneurship, 2006. **4**: p. 27–48.
8. Flores, M., *IFIP International Federation for Information Processing*, in *Network-Centric Collaboration and Supporting Fireworks*. 2006, Springer: Boston. p. 55–66.
9. Miles, R.E., C.C. Snow, and G. Miles, *TheFuture.org Long Range Planning*, 2000. **33**(3): p. 300–321.
10. Redoli, J., et al., *A model for the assessment and development of Internet-based information and communication services in small and medium enterprises* Technovation, 2008. **28**(7): p. 424–435.
11. Dong, B. and S. Liu, *Implementation of Web Resource Service to Product Design in International Federation for Information Processing -Knowledge Enterprise: Intelligent Strategies in Product Design, Manufacturing, and Management*, K. Wang, et al., Editors. 2006, Springer Boston.
12. Cascio, W.F., *Managing a virtual workplace*. The Academy of Management Executive, 2000. **14**(3): p. 81–90.
13. Hertel, G.T., S. Geister, and U. Konradt, *Managing virtual teams: A review of current empirical research*. Human Resource Management Review, 2005. **15**: p. 69–95.
14. Zenun, M.M.N., G. Loureiro, and C.S. Araujo, *The Effects of Teams' Co-location on Project Performance*, in *Complex Systems Concurrent Engineering-Collaboration, Technology Innovation and Sustainability*, G. Loureiro and R. Curran, Editors. 2007, Springer: London. p. 717–726.
15. Cascio, W.F. and S. Shurygailo, *E-Leadership and Virtual Teams*. Organizational Dynamics, 2003. **31**(4): p. 362–376.
16. Anderson, A.H., et al., *Virtual team meetings: An analysis of communication and context*. Computers in Human Behavior, 2007. **23**: p. 2558–2580.
17. Gassmann, O. and M. Von Zedtwitz, *Trends and determinants of managing virtual R&D teams*. R&D Management 2003. **33**(3): p. 243–262.
18. Powell, A., G. Piccoli, and B. Ives, *Virtual teams: a review of current literature and directions for future research*. The Data base for Advances in Information Systems, 2004. **35**(1): p. 6–36.
19. May, A. and C. Carter, *A case study of virtual team working in the European automotive industry*. International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics, 2001. **27**: p. 171–186.
20. Sorli, M., et al., *Managing product/process knowledge in the concurrent/simultaneous enterprise environment*. Robotics and Computer-Integrated Manufacturing, 2006. **22**: p. 399–408.
21. Kankanhalli, A., B.C.Y. Tan, and K.-K. Wei, *Conflict and Performance in Global Virtual Teams*. Journal of Management Information Systems, 2006. **23**(3): p. 237–274.
22. Chen, T.-Y., *Knowledge sharing in virtual enterprises via an ontology-based access control approach*. Computers in Industry, 2008. **Article In press**: p. No of Pages 18.
23. Shachaf, P., *Cultural diversity and information and communication technology impacts on global virtual teams: An exploratory study*. Information & Management, 2008 **45**(2): p. 131–142.
24. Ge, Z. and Q. Hu, *Collaboration in R&D activities: Firm-specific decisions*. European Journal of Operational Research 2008. **185**: p. 864–883.
25. Mulebeke, J.A.W. and L. Zheng, *Incorporating integrated product development with technology road mapping for dynamism and innovation*. International Journal of Product Development 2006 **3**(1): p. 56 - 76.
26. Guniš, A., J. Šišlák, and Š. Valčuha, *Implementation Of Collaboration Model Within SME's*, in *Digital Enterprise Technology-Perspectives and Future Challenges*, P.F. Cunha and P.G. Maropoulos, Editors. 2007, Springer US. p. 377–384
27. Zhang, S., W. Shen, and H. Ghenniwa, *A review of Internet-based product information sharing and visualization*. Computers in Industry 2004. **54**(1): p. 1–15.
28. Sridhar, V., et al., *Analyzing Factors that Affect Performance of Global Virtual Teams*, in *Second International Conference on Management of Globally Distributed Work* 2007: Indian Institute of Management Bangalore, India. p. 159–169.
29. Rabelo, L. and T.H.S. Jr., *Sustaining growth in the modern enterprise: A case study*. Jornal of Engineering and Technology Management JET-M, 2005. **22** p. 274–290.
30. Piccoli, G., A. Powell, and B. Ives, *Virtual teams: team control structure, work processes, and team effectiveness*. Information Technology & People, 2004. **17**(4): p. 359 - 379.
31. McDonough, E.F., K.B. Kahn, and G. Barczak, *An investigation of the use of global, virtual, and collocated new product development teams*. The Journal of Product Innovation Management, 2001. **18**(2): p. 110–120.

32. Rice, D.J., et al., *Improving the Effectiveness of Virtual Teams by Adapting Team Processes*. Computer Supported Cooperative Work, 2007. **16**: p. 567–594.
33. Bergiel, J.B., E.B. Bergiel, and P.W. Balsmeier, *Nature of virtual teams: a summary of their advantages and disadvantages*. Management Research News, 2008. **31**(2): p. 99-110.
34. Fuller, M.A., A.M. HARDIN, and R.M. DAVISON, *Efficacy in Technology-Mediated Distributed Team* Journal of Management Information Systems, 2006. **23**(3): p. 209-235.
35. Prasad, K. and K.B. Akhilesh, *Global virtual teams: what impacts their design and performance?* Team Performance Management, 2002 **8**(5/6): p. 102 - 112.
36. Olson-Buchanan, J.B., et al., *Utilizing virtual teams in a management principles course*. Education + Training, 2007. **49**(5): p. 408-423.
37. Boudreau, M.-C., et al., *Going Global: Using Information Technology to Advance the Competitiveness Of the Virtual Transnational Organization*. Academy of Management Executive, 1998. **12**(4): p. 120-128.
38. Biuk-Aghai, R.P., *Patterns of Virtual Collaboration*, in *Faculty of Information Technology*. 2003, University of Technology: Sydney. p. 291.
39. Liu, B. and S. Liu, *Value Chain Coordination with Contracts for Virtual R&D Alliance Towards Service*, in *The 3rd IEEE International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing, WiCom 2007*. 2007, IEEE Xplore: Shanghai, China. p. 3367-3370.
40. Criscuolo, P., *On the road again: Researcher mobility inside the R&D network*. Research Policy, 2005. **34**: p. 1350–1365
41. Samarah, I., S. Paul, and S. Tadisina. *Collaboration Technology Support for Knowledge Conversion in Virtual Teams: A Theoretical Perspective*. in *40th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS)*. 2007. Hawai.
42. Furst, S.A., et al., *Managing the life cycle of virtual teams*. Academy of Management Executive, 2004. **18**(2): p. 6-20.
43. Badrinarayanan, V. and D.B. Arnett, *Effective virtual new product development teams: an integrated framework*. Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing, 2008. **23**(4): p. 242-248.
44. Boutellier, R., et al., *Management of dispersed product development teams: The role of information technologies*. R&D Management, 1998. **28**(13-25).
45. Rosen, B., S. Furst, and R. Blackburn, *Overcoming Barriers to Knowledge Sharing in Virtual Teams*. Organizational Dynamics, 2007. **36**(3): p. 259–273.
46. Cummings, J.L. and B.S. Teng, *Transferring R&D knowledge: the key factors affecting knowledge transfer success*. Journal of Engineering Technology Management, 2003(20): p. 39–68.
47. Hossain, L. and R.T. Wigand, *ICT Enabled Virtual Collaboration through Trust*. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 2004. **10**(1).
48. Paul, S., et al., *Impact of heterogeneity and collaborative conflict management style on the performance of ynsynchronous global virtual teams*. Information & Management, 2004. **41**(3): p. 303-321.
49. Ojasalo, J., *Management of innovation networks: a case study of different approaches*. European Journal of Innovation Management, 2008. **11**(1): p. 51-86.
50. Martins, L.L., L.L. Gilson, and M.T. Maynard, *Virtual teams: What do we know and where do we go from here?* Journal of Management, 2004. **30**(6): p. 805–835.
51. Chen, T.Y., Y.M. Chen, and H.C. Ch, *Developing a trust evaluation method between co-workers in virtual project team for enabling resource sharing and collaboration*. Computers in Industry 2008. **59**(6): p. 565-579.
52. Lee-Kelley, L. and T. Sankey, *Global virtual teams for value creation and project success: A case study*. International Journal of Project Management 2008. **26**: p. 51–62.
53. Precup, L., et al., *Virtual team environment for collaborative research projects*. International Journal of Innovation and Learning, 2006. **3**(1): p. 77 - 94
54. Kratzer, J., R. Leenders, and J.V. Engelen, *Keeping Virtual R&D Teams Creative*. Industrial Research Institute, Inc., 2005. **March-April**: p. 13-16.
55. Gaudes, A., et al., *A Framework for Constructing Effective Virtual Teams* The Journal of E-working 2007 **1**(2): p. 83-97
56. Hunsaker, P.L. and J.S. Hunsaker, *Virtual teams: a leader's guide*. Team Performance Management, 2008. **14**(1/2): p. 86-101.

57. Chudoba, K.M., et al., *How virtual are we? Measuring virtuality and understanding its impact in a global organization*. Information Systems Journal, 2005. **15**(4): p. 279-306.
58. Poehler, L. and T. Schumacher, *The Virtual Team Challenge: Is It Time for Training?*, in *PICMET 2007 2007 Portland, Oregon - USA* p. 2205-2211.
59. Lurey, J.S. and M.S. Raisinghani, *An empirical study of best practices in virtual teams* Information & Management, 2001. **38**(8): p. 523-544.
60. Johnson, P., V. Heimann, and K. O'Neill, *The "wonderland" of virtual teams*. Journal of Workplace Learning, 2001. **13**(1): p. 24 - 30.
61. Chesbrough, H.W. and D.J. Teece, *Organizing for Innovation: When Is Virtual Virtuous?* Harvard Business Review Article, 2002. **August** p. 127-135.
62. Chen, H.H., et al., *Developing new products with knowledge management methods and process development management in a network*. Computers in Industry, 2008. **59**: p. 242-253.
63. Leenders, R.T.A.J., J.M.L.V. Engelen, and J. Kratzer, *Virtuality, communication, and new product team creativity: a social network perspective*. Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 2003. **20**: p. 69-92.
64. Atuahene-Gima, K., *The effects of centrifugal and centripetal forces on product development speed and quality: how does problem solving matter?*. Academy of Management Journal, 2003. **46**(3): p. 359-373.
65. Zakaria, N., A. Amelinckx, and D. Wilemon, *Working Together Apart? Building a Knowledge-Sharing Culture for Global Virtual Teams*. Creativity and Innovation Management, 2004. **13**(1): p. 15-29.
66. Vaccaro, A., F. Veloso, and S. Brusoni, *The Impact of Virtual Technologies on Organizational Knowledge Creation: An Empirical Study*, in *Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. 2008, Proceedings of the 41st Annual Publication p. 352-352.
67. Paul, S., et al. *Understanding Conflict in Virtual Teams: An Experimental Investigation using Content Analysis*. in *38th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. 2005 Hawaii.
68. Pauleen, D.J., *An Inductively Derived Model of Leader-Initiated Relationship Building with Virtual Team Members*. Journal of Management Information Systems, 2003. **20**(3): p. 227-256.
69. Ahuja, M.K., D.F. Galletta, and K.M. Carley, *Individual Centrality and Performance in Virtual R&D Groups: An Empirical Study* Management Science, 2003. **49**(1): p. 21-38.
70. Pawar, K.S. and S. Sharifi, *Physical or virtual team collocation: Does it matter?* International Journal of Production Economics 1997. **52**: p. 283-290.
71. Schmidt, J.B., M.M. Montoya-Weiss, and A.P. Massey, *New product development decision-making effectiveness: Comparing individuals, face-to-face teams, and virtual teams*. Decision Sciences, 2001. **32**(4): p. 1-26.
72. Ortiz de Guinea, A., J. Webster, and S. Staples. *A Meta-Analysis of the Virtual Teams Literature*. in *Symposium on High Performance Professional Teams Industrial Relations Centre*. 2005. School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
73. Jain, V.K. and D.K. Sobek, *Linking design process to customer satisfaction through virtual design of experiments*. Research in Engineering Design, 2006. **17** (2): p. 59-71.
74. Kirkman, B.L., et al., *Five challenges to virtual team success: lessons from Sabre Inc*. Academy of Management Executive, 2002. **16**(3): p. 67-79.
75. Taifi, N., *Organizational Collaborative Model of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Extended Enterprise Era: Lessons to Learn from a Large Automotive Company and its dealers' Network*, in *Proceedings of the 2nd PROLEARN Doctoral Consortium on Technology Enhanced Learning, in the 2nd European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning*. 2007, CEUR Workshop Proceedings.: Crete, Greece.
76. Baskerville, R. and J. Nandhakumar, *Activating and Perpetuating Virtual Teams: Now That We're Mobile, Where Do We Go?* IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 2007. **50**(1): p. 17 - 34
77. Martinez-Sanchez, A., et al., *Teleworking and new product development*. European Journal of Innovation Management, 2006. **9**(2): p. 202-214.
78. Jacobsa, J., et al., *Exploring defect causes in products developed by virtual teams* Information and Software Technology, 2005. **47**(6): p. 399-410.
79. Ocker, R.J. and J. Fjermestad, *Communication differences in virtual design teams: findings from a multi-method analysis of high and low performing experimental teams*. The DATA BASE for Advances in Information Systems, 2008. **39**(1): p. 51-67.

80. Griffith, T.L., J.E. Sawyer, and M.A. Neale, *Virtualness and Knowledge in Teams: Managing the Love Triangle in Organizations, Individuals, and Information Technology*. MIS Quarterly, 2003. **27**(2): p. 265-287.
81. Bell, B.S. and S.W.J. Kozlowski, *A Typology of Virtual Teams: Implications for Effective Leadership*. Group and Organization Management, 2002. **27**(1): p. 14-49.
82. Hinds, P.J. and M. Mortensen, *Understanding Conflict in Geographically Distributed Teams: The Moderating Effects of Shared Identity, Shared Context, and Spontaneous Communication*. Organization Science, 2005. **16**(3): p. 290-307.
83. Ramayah, T., et al., *Internal Group Dynamics, Team Characteristics and Team Effectiveness: A Preliminary Study of Virtual Teams*. The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management, 2003. **3**: p. 415-435.
84. Shachaf, P., *Bridging cultural diversity through e-mail*. Journal of Global Information Technology Management, 2005. **8**(2): p. 46-60.
85. Munkvold, B.E. and I. Zigurs, *Process and technology challenges in swift-starting virtual teams*. Information & Management, 2007. **44**(3): p. 287-299.
86. Ryssen, S.V. and S.H. Godar, *Going international without going international: multinational virtual teams*. Journal of International Management, 2000 **6** (1): p. 49-60.
87. Acs, Z.J., et al., *The Internationalization of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: A Policy Perspective*. Small Business Economics, 1997. **9**: p. 7-20.
88. Deros, B.M., S.M. Yusof, and A.M. Salleh, *A benchmarking implementation framework for automotive manufacturing SMEs*. Benchmarking: An International Journal, 2006. **13**(4).
89. Kuo, H.C. and Y. Li, *A Dynamic Decision Model of SMEs' FDI*. Small Business Economics, 2003. **20**: p. 219-231.
90. Schröder, H.H., *Past, Present and Future of Knowledge Integration*, in *Knowledge Integration-The Practice of Knowledge Management in Small and Medium Enterprises*, A. Jetter, et al., Editors. 2006, Physica-Verlag HD. p. 175-191.
91. Choi, T.Y., *Korea's Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: Unsung Heroes or Economic Laggards?* Academy of Management Executive, 2003. **17**(2).
92. Corso, M., et al., *Knowledge management configurations in Italian small-to-medium enterprises*. Integrated Manufacturing Systems, 2003. **14**(1): p. 46-56.
93. Nunes, M.B., F. Annansingh, and B. Eaglestone, *Knowledge management issues in knowledge-intensive SMEs*. Journal of Documentation, 2006. **62**(1).
94. Blomqvist, K., et al., *Towards networked R&D management: the R&D approach of Sonera Corporation as an example*. R&D Management, 2004. **34**(5): p. 591-603.
95. Low, L., *A putative East Asian business model*. International Journal of Social Economics, 2006. **33**(7).
96. Dickson, P.H., K.M. Weaver, and F. Hoy, *Opportunism in the R&D alliances of SMEs: The roles of the institutional environment and SME size*. Journal of Business Venturing, 2006. **21**: p. 487-513.
97. Gassmann, O. and M.M. Keupp, *The competitive advantage of early and rapidly internationalising SMEs in the biotechnology industry: A knowledge-based view*. Journal of World Business, 2007. **42**(3): p. 350-366.
98. Jones, O. and A. Macpherson, *Inter-Organizational Learning and Strategic Renewal in SMEs*. Long Range Planning, 2006. **39**: p. 155-175.
99. Sharma, M.K. and R. Bhagwat, *Practice of information systems: Evidence from select Indian SMEs*. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 2006 **17**(2): p. 199 - 223.
100. Perrini, F., A. Russo, and A. Tencati, *CSR Strategies of SMEs and Large Firms. Evidence from Italy*. Journal of Business Ethics, 2007. **74**(3): p. 285-300.
101. Schatz, C., *A Methodology for Production Development - The Body of Knowledge Approach*, in *Faculty of Engineering Science and Technology, Institute for Production and Quality Engineering*. 2006, Norwegian University of Science and Technology: Trondheim. p. 116.
102. Egbu, C.O., S. Hari, and S.H. Renukappa, *Knowledge management for sustainable competitiveness in small and medium surveying practices*. Structural Survey, 2005. **23**(1): p. 7-21.
103. Kotey, B. and P. Slade, *Formal Human Resource Management Practices in Small Growing Firms*. Journal of Small Business Management, 2005. **43**(1): p. 16-40.

104. Love, P.E.D. and Z. Irani, *An exploratory study of information technology evaluation and benefits management practices of SMEs in the construction industry* Information and Management, 2004. **42**(1): p. 227-242.
105. Sarosa, S. and D. Zowghi, *Strategy for Adopting Information Technology for SMEs: Experience in Adopting Email within an Indonesian Furniture Company*. Electronic Journal of Information Systems Evaluation, 2003. **6**(2): p. 165-176.
106. Mahemba, C.M. and E.J.D. Bruijn, *Innovation Activities by Small and Medium-sized Manufacturing Enterprises in Tanzania*. Creativity and Innovation Management, 2003 **12**(3): p. 162-173.
107. Wu, M., et al., *E-commerce Adoption in China's Service SMEs: a Study from Web Usability Perspective*. Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics 2007. **2**(4): p. 1-15.
108. Canavesio, M.M. and E. Martinez, *Enterprise modeling of a project-oriented fractal company for SMEs networking*. Computers in Industry 2007. **58**(8-9): p. 794-813.
109. Huang, X., G.N. Soutar, and A. Brown, *Measuring new product success: an empirical investigation of Australian SMEs*. Industrial Marketing Management, 2004. **33**: p. 117– 123.
110. Narula, R., *R&D Collaboration by SMEs: new opportunities and limitations in the face of globalisation*. Technovation 2004. **24**(2): p. 153-161.
111. Nieto, M.J. and Z. Fern'andez, *The role of information technology in corporate strategy of small and medium enterprises*. Journal of International Entrepreneurship 2005 **3**(4): p. 251-262.
112. Sarosa, S., *The information technology adoption process within Indonesian small and medium enterprises, in Faculty of Information Technology*. 2007, University of Technology: Sydney. p. 248.
113. Davis, C.H. and E. Sun, *Business Development Capabilities in Information Technology SMEs in a Regional Economy: An Exploratory Study*. The Journal of Technology Transfer, 2006. **31**(1): p. 145-161.
114. Starbek, M. and J. Grum, *Concurrent engineering in small companies*. International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture, 2002. **42**(3): p. 417-426.
115. Aragón-Sánchez, A. and G. Sánchez-Marín, *Strategic Orientation, Management Characteristics, and Performance: A Study of Spanish SMEs*. Small Business Management, 2005. **43**(3): p. 287-308.
116. Laforet, S. and J. Tann, *Innovative characteristics of small manufacturing firms*. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 2006 **13**(3): p. 363 - 380.
117. Barnett, E. and J. Storey, *Managers' accounts of innovation processes in small and medium-sized enterprises*. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 2000. **7**(4): p. 315 - 324.
118. Haga, T., *Action research and innovation in networks, dilemmas and challenges: two cases AI & Society* 2005. **19**(4): p. 362-383.
119. Axelson, J.v., *Transfer of production knowledge to small and medium-size enterprises - a suggested model, in Department of Production Engineering*. 2005, Royal Institute of Technology: STOCKHOLM. p. 118.
120. Axelson, J.v., *On the development of production methods for transfer to small to medium-sized enterprises, in Department of Production Engineering*. 2007, KTH-Royal Institute of Technology: STOCKHOLM. p. 204.
121. Massa, S. and S. Testa, *Innovation and SMEs: Misaligned perspectives and goals among entrepreneurs, academics, and policy makers*. Technovation, 2008. **28**(7): p. 393-407
122. Carbonara, N., *Information and communication technology and geographical clusters: opportunities and spread*. Technovation, 2005. **25**: p. 213-222.
123. Chen, M., et al., *Team Spirit: Design, implementation, and evaluation of a Web-based group decision support system*. Decision Support Systems, 2007. **43**: p. 1186–1202.
124. Partanen, J., et al., *Social capital in the growth of science-and-technology-based SMEs*. Industrial Marketing Management, 2008. **37**: p. 513-522.
125. Karaev, A., S.C.L. Koh, and L.T. Szamosi, *The cluster approach and SME competitiveness: a review*. Manufacturing Technology Management, 2007. **18**(7): p. 818-835.
126. Kearney, S. and G. Abdul-Nour, *SME and quality performance in networking environment*. Computers & Industrial Engineering 2004. **46**(4).
127. Wang, C.H. and S.Y. Chou, *Entities' representation modes and their communication effects in collaborative design for SMEs*. The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 2008 **37**(5-6 ): p. 455-470.
128. Pullen, A., et al., *Configurations of external SME characteristics to explain differences in innovation performance, in High Technology Small Firms Conference 2008*: Twente University, Netherlands.

129. Hanna, V. and K. Walsh, *Small Firm Networks: A Successful Approach to Innovation?*. R&D Management, 2002. **32**(3): p. 201-207.
130. Caputo, A.C., et al., *A methodological framework for innovation transfer to SMEs*. Industrial Management & Data Systems, 2002. **102**(5): p. 271-283.
131. Bodorick, P., J. Dhaliwal, and D. Jutla, *Supporting the e-business readiness of small and medium-sized enterprises: approaches and metrics*. Internet Research, 2002. **12**(2): p. 139-164.
132. Jansson, H. and S. Sandberg, *Internationalization of small and medium sized enterprises in the Baltic Sea Region*. Journal of International Management, 2008. **14**(1): p. 65-77.
133. Kim, K.S., T.L. Knotts, and S.C. Jones, *Characterizing viability of small manufacturing enterprises (SME) in the market*. Expert Systems with Applications 2008. **34**(1): p. 128-134.
134. Yusuff, R.M., L.W. Chek, and M.S.J. Hashmi, *Advanced Manufacturing Technologies in SMEs*. CACCI Journal of Commerce & Industry, 2005. **1**: p. 1-11.
135. Lin, C., Y.A. Huang, and S.W. Tseng, *A Study of Planning and Implementation Stages in Electronic Commerce Adoption and Evaluation: The Case of Australian SMEs*. Contemporary Management Research, 2007. **3**(1): p. 83-100.
136. Mahajar, A.J.b., S.S. Abdullah, and J.b.M. Yunus. *The Effectiveness of Small and Medium Development Corporation (SMIDEC) Export Assistance Programs on Malaysian SME's*. in *Proceedings of Advances in Global Business Research* 2006. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
137. Lan, H., et al., *A web-based manufacturing service system for rapid product development*. Computers in Industry, 2004. **54**(1): p. 51 - 67
138. Zhan, H.F., et al., *A web-based collaborative product design platform for dispersed network manufacturing*. Journal of Materials Processing Technology, 2003. **138**(1-3): p. 600-604.
139. Holloway, S. and C. Julien, *Developing Collaborative Applications Using Sliverware in Lecture Notes in Computer Science ,On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems* 2006, R. Meersman and Z. Tari, Editors. 2006, Springer-Verlag: Berlin / Heidelberg. p. 587-604.
140. Li, W.D., J.Y.H. Fuh, and Y.S. Wong, *An Internet-enabled integrated system for co-design and concurrent engineering*. Computers in Industry, 2004. **55**(1): p. 87-103
141. Koh, S.C.L. and M. Simpson, *Change and uncertainty in SME manufacturing environments using ERP*. Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management, 2005. **16**(6): p. 629 - 653.