

Public sector cooperation and spatial data sharing

PhD colloquium
Walter T. de Vries
14 June 2009

Research dilemma

Public sector organizations working with geolCT need to integrate (their processes and structures), yet individual organizations typically pursue their own strategic priorities

Hence, integration dependent on discretionary space claimed by individual organizations

- Causes uncertainty
- Causes reactions to uncertainty
- Reactions based on 'regulatory artifact' (which is?) of uncertainty coordination

Research questions

1. Which internal and external uncertainties cause which changes in the discretionary space of public organizations cooperating with spatial data and/or geolCT? (resulting in opting in or opting out of a cooperation)
2. What is the effect of these changes to the position(ing) of the individual public sector organizations within the public administration as a whole

Followed approach

1. Describe how geoICT and spatial data sharing relate to discretionary spaces of organizations (approach literature review):

Results:

1. Technological advances restrict space by creating standards, and (top-down) prescriptions
2. Socio-organizational and historical environment in which geoICT is developed and shared opens up space through political-organizational pressures

Followed approach - 2

2. Explore which pressures are perceived to play a major role in current spatial data cooperation projects (approach survey / interviews):

Results:

1. Representative and professional structures play a major role
2. Certain national projects and policies play a role for individual projects, yet others (e.g. Egov) don't

Followed approach - 3

Develop theoretical framework / model to explain and 'predict' certain (discretionary behavior) when addressing internal or external uncertainties (approach induce from exploration):

- **Unit of analysis** – Organizational behavior (Compliance; Avoidance; Mimicking;)
- **Theoretical explanations:**
 - **Dependency relations**
 - Expected behavior: Lobbying; Maneuvering; Politicking
 - **Transaction costs:**
 - Expected behavior : Asset specificity; Uncertainty; Frequency; bureaucracy

Still to do

Part of theoretical framework
Part of empirical data collection and description
of findings – based on cases
Analysis of empirical data collection

Conceptual and methodological problems

1. Does theory explain or predict forward, or backward (where do preconceptions start and end; what still needs to be proven / explained, and what may be assumed / hypothesized; how to distinct between explanations)?
2. What to look for in discourses / interview transcripts? Free vs. guided coding – e.g. inclusion behavior ; when does “we” mean “I” and when “we together”?
3. Explanatory part of behavior – linking findings back / forward to theory
