

**PROJECT-LEVEL INTEGRATIVE MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE CREATION: AN
EMPIRICAL TEST**

C. Annique UN*
Cornell University
Johnson Graduate School of Management
370 Sage Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853
Phone: (607) 255-0053
E-mail: cau3@cornell.edu

This Draft: November 30, 2002

Draft. Comments are welcome.
Please do not distribute nor quote without previous permission

© C. Annique Un, 2001

* The paper is based on the data collected for my thesis at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Sloan School of Management. The MIT-Japan Program Starr Foundation, the CS Holding Fellowship in International Business, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Doctoral Fellowship provided funding for this study. I would like to thank the managers of the companies studied for sharing their experiences with me. The comments of participants at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Proseminar, Academy of International Business, and the Academy of Management helped improve the paper. I am also grateful to Eleanor Westney, Michael Beer, John Carroll, and Alvaro Cuervo-Cazurra for their comments and suggestions. All errors remain mine.

**PROJECT-LEVEL INTEGRATIVE MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE CREATION: AN
EMPIRICAL TEST**

Abstract

This paper integrates the knowledge-based view of the firm and new product development team literature to analyze how firms develop the capability to create new knowledge and thus extending the knowledge-based view of the firm. The results indicate that internal and external knowledge sharing and common knowledge among project members support this capability. Among the integrative mechanisms, integrative development better predicts internal and external knowledge sharing than integrative reward. Membership selection based on company tenure better predicts common knowledge than selecting on common knowledge.

Key words: Knowledge-based view, Integrative mechanisms, and Knowledge creation

INTRODUCTION

The capability to create new knowledge in firms is critical for competitive advantage, but we still do not know how to develop it. In practice, when in 1993 the inability of Ford Motor, the US carmaker to create new knowledge using customer feedback from their customer service centers in Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and in the United States about the Ford Explorer rollover problem costs them dearly in the year 2000 (Economist, 2000). Ford Explorer, which was a best-selling sports utility vehicle in the United States before the year 2000 had a body that was based on the body of the Ford Bronco, which had problems with rollover. This rollover problem led Ford Motor to a drop in stock price and put its brand in jeopardy. However, when Ford Motor finally created new knowledge for the innovation of the Ford Explorer 2002 model customer satisfaction and stock price increased (Kouky, 2002). The new knowledge created led to an innovation to the previous models of the Ford Explorer that includes a boxed frame that is different from the Ford Bronco, independent rear suspension, power-train enhancements, and a new safety canopy with rollover capability. Meanwhile, Honda and Toyota Motor, which have the capability to continuously create new knowledge for their product innovation, outperformed Ford Motor, especially with its Honda Accord and Toyota Camry (Davis, 2002).

However, despite extensive debate about the value of firms' capability to mobilize knowledge in organization for the creation of new knowledge such as for product innovation, there is still limited understanding of "how" organizations develop it. We still lack knowledge about the key factors and management practices that firms can use to develop this capability when organizing specifically to create new knowledge such as for product innovation. As Wernerfelt (1997) states: We have made progress in discussing resources in terms of their effects but we do not know what they are . . . Many resources are only known indirectly. A good example of this is

'group resources'. What exactly is it that makes one group of people better at doing something than another? (p. XVIII)

While the level of analysis of the knowledge creation capability is the organization, the unit of analysis is the project team, with members coming together to share knowledge and create new knowledge such as for product innovation (Kogut & Zander, 1992; Teece et al., 1997; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Therefore, the overarching research question of this paper is, what are the project team factors and management practices that facilitate new knowledge creation? In answering this question, I link and integrate the theoretical approaches of the knowledge-based view of the firm, specifically the literature on organizational capabilities (Grant, 1996a, 1996b; Kogut & Zander, 1992; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Tsoukas, 1996) and the new product development team literature (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992a, 1992b; Clark & Wheelwright, 1992; Griffin & Hauser, 1992; Keller, 2001).

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

The knowledge-based view of the firm views the firm as a distributed knowledge system (Tsoukas, 1996) and that the capability to mobilize knowledge from various parts and use it to create new knowledge that meets the demands of the external market is critical for competitive advantage. Therefore, one of the most important organizational capabilities is the ability of firms to combine different types of knowledge, especially firm-specific knowledge embodied in firms' employees, to create new knowledge that enable firms to achieve and sustain their competitive advantage. A firm that has the capability to create new knowledge not only can create new knowledge that better meets the demands of the external markets, it can do so in a timely manner, and using less resources to accomplish it. This concept is related to other concepts such as "combinative capability" (Kogut & Zander, 1992), "integrative capability" (Lawrence & Lorsch,

1967), "core capability" (Leonard-Barton, 1995), and "dynamic capability" (Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997). This knowledge creation capability is viewed as a type of strategic resource (Foss, 1997; Foss, Knudsen, & Montgomery, 1995), because it is subject to time compression for its development requiring the management of employees such that they interact and share knowledge to create new knowledge (Dierickx & Cool, 1989).

The Capability to Create New Knowledge

The capability to create new knowledge has been studied previously in two related camps: one that discusses in detail the capability to mobilize knowledge, which is the transferring or sharing of knowledge that has already been created (Grant, 1996a, 1996b; Szulanski, 1996; Hansen, 1999; Tsai, 2002). Another camp describes the capability to create or produce new knowledge (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Von Krogh, Ichijo, & Nonaka, 2000) through the combination of existing knowledge.

Researchers who emphasize knowledge mobilization (Grant, 1996b; Szulanski, 1996; Hansen, 1999; Tsai, 2002) tend to view motivation of individuals to interact to share knowledge as problematic. Therefore, they suggest that individuals should be managed to build social ties (Hansen, 1999; Tsai, 2002) or directly provide them with economic incentives for knowledge sharing (Milgrom & Roberts, 1992; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997).

Researchers who examine knowledge creation (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Von Krogh, Ichijo, & Nonaka, 2000) describe in detail the process of knowledge creation, paying less attention to the drivers of knowledge mobilization. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) present a comprehensive model of the way in which knowledge, particularly for product innovation, is created in organizations. Their model involves two main processes, the mobilization of individual knowledge and the conversion of individual knowledge into organizational knowledge

that comes in the form of product innovations, with stronger emphasis on the latter process. Leonard-Barton's (1995) model of knowledge creation for innovation is viewed as a shared problem-solving activity (1995: 61; Leonard & Sensiper, 1998), and the author suggests that the facilitators of knowledge creation are more than just incentives. Common knowledge or the overlapping knowledge among team members plays a large role in new knowledge creation. The knowledge that individuals have in common with each other enable them to understand and use the knowledge being shared and convert that into new organizational knowledge such as the innovation of the Ford Explorer that better satisfies the external market. These researchers suggest that individuals in organization perhaps should be managed to have some common knowledge with each other.

Moreover, the organizational capability literature based in the knowledge-based view deals with the organization as its level of analysis; however, its unit of analysis is a group of individuals or project team. It is a team of individuals rather than the whole organization that come together to share knowledge and create new knowledge for a specific task (Kogut & Zander, 1992; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Teece et al., 1997) such as the innovation of the Ford Explorer 2002. Specifically, project teams are mechanisms for knowledge mobilization and conversion into organizational knowledge that embodied in products and services that the firms provide for the market. Therefore, some organizational capability theorists suggest that the main driver behind this capability is how well small groups of carriers of core competence or project teams can mobilize and convert their individual knowledge into organizational knowledge in the form of product and/or process innovation (Kogut & Zander, 1992; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Teece et al., 1997).

In the knowledge creation model (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995), the level of analysis is clearly the company; however, the unit of analysis is the project team organized to create new knowledge for product innovation. Leonard-Barton (1995) also discusses core capability at the company level (business unit), but her unit of analysis is clearly a project team consisting of members coming together to share their knowledge to create new knowledge resulting in new products. By focusing on the organization level of analysis, the literature does not provide an explanation of what organizations do when organizing specifically to share knowledge and create knowledge. This limitation in the knowledge-based view can be addressed by linking it to the new product development team literature (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Clark & Wheelwright, 1992; Griffin & Hauser, 1992; Keller, 2001; Subramaniam & Venkatraman, 2001). I view this literature as being about knowledge creation though specifically for product innovation that analyzes project team processes and characteristics and how they relate to project performance; thus, providing us with some understanding of how this capability may be developed using project team integrative mechanisms.

Determinants of the Capability to Create New Knowledge

The creation of new knowledge is better facilitated by interaction among individuals with different knowledge sets than by interaction among individuals with similar knowledge sets. Though in the case of knowledge creation for the development of a particular product, an individual might initiate an idea, in order for this idea to become a product innovation that generates value for the firm, it has to be combined with other types of knowledge such as design engineering, manufacturing, marketing, and customer services, in order to ensure that it suits the demands of the external markets. Therefore, the possibility of exchanging knowledge and recombining existing knowledge in order to create new knowledge is greater when the people

involved have diverse knowledge sets; in this way a degree of economies of scope in knowledge is achieved.

The interaction among individuals for knowledge creation often requires the use of teams rather than the organization as a whole. In contrast to knowledge mobilization or transfer (Szulanski, 1996; Tsai, 2002; Zander and Kogut, 1995), which can be performed unidirectionally from source to recipient, such as when diffusing practices across sub-units of the firm, knowledge creation requires multidirectional interaction among people with diverse knowledge sets. This multidirectional interaction is especially important, as it is not only the transfer of explicit knowledge that is involved, but also that of tacit knowledge, which can only be acquired through personal interaction (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). This multidirectional interaction is facilitated by the use of teams with a limited number of people; this enables members to become both sources and recipients of knowledge.

The interaction among individuals in project teams with different sets of knowledge that are exchanged and transformed to create new knowledge has two prerequisites: the willingness of these individuals situated in different parts of the distributed knowledge system to exchange knowledge in order to create new knowledge, and understanding among the individuals who exchange knowledge. First, individuals need to be willing to establish interactions and share their knowledge sets to create new knowledge; that is, they need to be provided with incentives, which can be economic (Hansen and Haas, 2001; Kerr, 1975; Milgrom and Roberts, 1992) and/or social (Hansen, 1999; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Second, the interaction and exchange of knowledge among individuals with different knowledge sets requires an understanding among them that facilitates their interaction; that is, they need a common code (Arrow, 1974), common knowledge (Grant, 1996a), or overlapping knowledge (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995).

Each of these factors is necessary but insufficient on its own. Without willingness on the part of the individuals to interact, there is little exchange of knowledge among them. Without understanding among individuals, knowledge cannot be exchanged in a meaningful manner, because misunderstanding could occur (Tsoukas, 1996: 16). Only when the two coexist are mobilization and subsequent new knowledge creation possible.

Project Team Integrative Processes, Characteristics, and Knowledge Creation

I view new product development team literature as being about knowledge creation, though specifically for product innovation. The literature deals specifically with the time at which firms organize their employees into project teams specifically to generate new knowledge. It suggests that team-level processes such as communication among team members (e.g., Allen, 1970; Allen, 1977; Griffin & Hauser, 1992; Souder, 1987; Takeishi, 2001) and between team members and their external relations (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992a; Ancona & Caldwell, 1992b; Keller, 2001) are critical for project outcomes. Without any empirical tests, these researchers suggest that these team processes are facilitated by a set of project team management practices such as team leadership (Clark & Fujimoto, 1991; Clark & Wheelwright, 1992), development (Roth & Kleiner, 2000), reward for team performance (Ancona & Caldwell, 1999), and selection for common knowledge among members (Madhavan & Grover, 1998).

Though there are other factors which the new product development team suggest as facilitators of the innovation process (see Brown and Eisenhardt, 1995; Fiol, 1996 for a review), in this study I analyze three main project team-level integrative factors, which I argue are supporters of project performance and therefore the basis for organization's capability to create new knowledge. Unlike previous studies, which views communication as knowledge sharing, I analyze (1) internal knowledge sharing frequency, which is the frequency of knowledge sharing among

team members; (2) external knowledge sharing frequency between team members and their external relations who are not team members, and (3) their common knowledge, which is the knowledge that team members have in common with each other. The main reason for the distinction between communication and knowledge sharing is that not all communication among team members is knowledge sharing relevant for project performance. For example, we can imagine that when a team member calls each other up to say “hello” and ask about each other’s well being, because of their friendship ties, communication occurs and knowledge sharing about each other’s well being happens, however, this knowledge that is being shared is irrelevant for project performance. In other words, communication is a necessary but insufficient condition for knowledge sharing and creation for product innovation that creates value for the company. Therefore, I expand on the analysis of the effect of communication on project performance to analyze knowledge sharing among project team members about the project, which is internal knowledge sharing, and knowledge sharing between team members and their external relations outside the team, which is external knowledge sharing. Moreover, common knowledge is the knowledge sets that team members have in common with each other. For example, if an R& D engineering team member has worked in the sales/marketing function, this team member has some knowledge in common with team members that represent the sales/market function. I propose that these factors are key determinants of project performance and that these factors are facilitated by a set of project team integrative practices such as development, reward, and selection.

Internal knowledge sharing. Knowledge sharing frequency between project team members situated in different parts of the organization has a positive effect on knowledge creation such as for product innovation. The main reason is that because of specialization of individual’s daily tasks and his or her training and education, especially in the United States (Aoki, 1988; Milgrom &

Roberts, 1992; Schein, 1996), an individual in a particular department, i.e., engineering or production, does not have the ability to develop a new product by him or herself, manufacture it, put in on the market that meets the demands of the external markets. Therefore, product innovation that are successful in the market place requires knowledge sharing among a group of individuals that are based in R&D and engineering, customer services, marketing, and manufacturing (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Individuals in customer services and marketing need to understand technological capabilities and constraints in terms of design and production, and both R&D and production need to understand market demands. Individuals in charge of designing the product not only need to incorporate customer demands but also need to understand the manufacturing capabilities of their product design. Because of task specialization and lack of incentives for knowledge sharing among these individuals on a day-to-day basis in organizations, (Aoki, 1988; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Milgrom & Roberts, 1992; Schein, 1996), I argue that successful projects experience higher frequency of knowledge sharing among project team members, while unsuccessful projects are those that had lower frequency of inter-departmental knowledge sharing. This leads me to hypothesize that:

H1a. Project team internal knowledge sharing frequency is positively related to project performance (product innovation, efficiency, customer satisfaction, and speed-to-market) as an outcome of the capability to create new knowledge.

External knowledge sharing frequency. External knowledge sharing frequency between team members and their external relations outside the team also has a positive effect on team performance. Based on the argument that individuals are hired into an organization to perform a specialized task with their highly specialized education (Aoki, 1988; Milgrom & Roberts, 1992; Schein, 1996), in performing the task that requires the integration of knowledge from different

departments, such as product innovation, the higher the frequency of knowledge sharing the better for project performance especially external knowledge sharing coming from within the same departmental area. The main reason is that a task such as product innovation not only requires inter-departmental knowledge sharing but also deep knowledge and expertise from each functional area (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992b; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). This leads us to the hypothesis that:

H1b. Project team external knowledge sharing frequency is positively related project performance (product innovation, efficiency, customer satisfaction, and speed-to-market) as an outcome of the capability to create new knowledge.

Common knowledge. The knowledge that the team members based in different departments have in common supports project performance. This common knowledge is similar to the idea of overlapping knowledge or redundant knowledge (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). The common knowledge among team members enables them to take the perspective of other team members in the process of knowledge sharing and convert that knowledge into new knowledge resulting in product innovation. Additionally, the knowledge that they have in common provides them with the absorptive capacity for other types of knowledge present on the team. For example, if an engineer has been trained or worked in marketing, when sharing knowledge with team members that represent the marketing function, he or she is more likely to understand and absorb knowledge about marketing that is being shared than an engineer who does not have any marketing knowledge. This common knowledge facilitates the conversion and integration of different types of knowledge shared in the team to create and achieve product innovation and accomplishes it more quickly and efficiently. The underlying logic is that this common knowledge provides team members with the cognitive resources to combine insights

synergistically from multiple knowledge sets. In the context of cross-functional project teams, the common knowledge of team members plays an especially important role in maintaining a disciplinary vision that integrates multiple perspectives and manages conflicting technical trade-off. The cognitive skills to handle such integration and trade-off, gained through the process of integrating two disparate areas, will help the team leader craft a unifying vision that does justice to all the disciplines represented. However, while the common knowledge enhances the sharing and integration process, up to a point, the lack of diversity of deep functional knowledge and expertise hinders project performance that requires diverse knowledge sets. The lack of diversity decreases the creative abrasion that is also critical for new knowledge creation especially for product innovation (Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). This leads me to hypothesize that:

H1c. The amount of common knowledge among team members and project performance in terms of product innovation and customer satisfaction with the innovation has an inverted Ushaped relationship, but a positive relationship with other aspects of project performance, particularly speed-to-market and efficiency.

Project Team Integrative Management Practices and their Integrative Processes and Characteristics

Project team integrative practices affect project performance by affecting their processes and characteristics. The project team integrative management practices that facilitate knowledge creation are: (1) integrative reward, (2) integrative development, and (3) integrative membership selection.

Rewards and knowledge sharing frequency. The reward for project performance also has an impact on project performance because it affects knowledge sharing among team members. It has been argued that employees working on teams are willing to share knowledge when they are

rewarded for these behaviors (Kerr, 1975; Milgrom & Roberts, 1992). Wageman and Baker (1997) studied the relationships between team reward and team outcomes in a laboratory setting, and found that team reward has a positive effect on observed cooperation. Menon et al. (1997) studied cross-functional product development teams, and found that rewarding project team performance increases interdepartmental communication. Following these theories of motivation, I argue that project teams that receive a reward for their performance are likely to share knowledge more frequently to enhance task performance than teams that do not receive a reward. Moreover, project teams that receive a reward for their performance are more likely to experience higher frequency of knowledge sharing outside the team to search for resources that enhance task performance. These discussions lead to the hypotheses that:

H2a. Project team rewards for a particular project team task performance are positively related to project team internal knowledge sharing frequency.

H2b. Project team rewards for a particular project team task performance are positively related to project team-external knowledge sharing frequency.

Project team development also facilitates team performance by affecting project internal and external knowledge sharing frequency. Based on Roth and Kleiner (2000), I define project team development as team building or training. It is a process of taking a collection of individuals with different departmental objectives, functional backgrounds, and expertise, and transforming them into an integrated, effective work unit. It accomplishes this by building consensus on the objectives for the team, on the schedule for team to meet to work on the project, process of dealing with conflict among team members, and how to find resources that are necessary to conduct the project successfully. Since project team development is a process by which knowledge sharing among team members are facilitated by organizing their work processes such

as setting the agenda for meetings to share knowledge among team members to work on the project, task allocation and suggestions about the resources needed, and where to find additional knowledge outside the team to accomplish the project, I predict that:

H2c. Project team development is positively related to project team internal knowledge sharing frequency.

H2d. Project team development is positively related to project team external knowledge sharing frequency.

Project team membership selection. Project team membership selection influences the knowledge creation process and therefore project performance. The underlying logic is that common knowledge among team members does not occur automatically on project teams, since the pool of human resources in the organization contains different knowledge sets (Iansiti, 1998; Leonard-Barton, 1995; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Therefore, in order to ensure some common knowledge on project teams, members are selected based in part on this factor (Madhavan & Grover, 1998; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995: 77). In contrast to Japanese companies studied by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) in which employees are systematically developed to have overlapping knowledge (Aoki, 1988), for firms located in the United States, because of specialization of education and task in organization and that deep expertise rather than breadth of functional knowledge is valued (Leonard-Barton, 1995), the better predictor of common knowledge among team members is the employees' length of tenure with the company. Though empirical tests are limited, it has been argued that in the United States, there is little incentive on both the part of the employers and employees to acquire cross-functional overlapping knowledge (Leonard-Barton, 1995). For the employers, the investment in employees to have some cross-functional overlapping knowledge is viewed as risky, because employees might leave the company before the investment

is recovered (Aoki, 1988; Milgrom & Roberts, 1992). For the employees, since they are rewarded for depth rather than breadth of functional expertise, they are motivated to develop only their functional expertise. However, Leonard-Barton (1995: 76) suggests that there are some individuals in the company that have some breadth of knowledge though they are not developed systematically. Since companies, especially those located in the United States, lack the system of tracking their employees' knowledge (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990), managers in charge of organizing employees into project teams to create knowledge may not have accurate information about who knows what outside of their current positions. Therefore, this leads me to hypothesize that:

H2e. Project team membership selection based on their length of tenure with the company rather than selection for common knowledge among team members is positively related to common knowledge on project team.

In summary, the study proposes that the capability to create new knowledge is facilitated by project team processes and characteristics specifically project team-internal knowledge sharing frequency, project team-external knowledge sharing frequency, and project team common knowledge. Moreover, these factors are supported by project team integrative practices -team development, reward, and membership selection.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The empirical test is performed on data from a survey of 99 cross-functional knowledge creation teams involving 495 team members of 33 organizations of large US and Japanese multinational firms in the divisions in which they manufacture computer, photo imaging, and automobile industries operating in the United States.

I selected the industries based on their different innovation cycles –short in the computer industry, medium-sized in the photo imaging industry, and long in the automobile industry– that

affect the time pressure on gathering and processing different types of knowledge for innovation (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

I chose firms that met two criteria. First, they were the largest in their respective industries based on revenue as reported in the Hoover's HandBook of World Business (1999). Second, they had customer service centers in the USA and Japan dealing with similar products within the same division. This requirement was necessary because this study is part of a larger one that compares sources of knowledge creation for product innovation of US and Japanese multinationals in both the United States and Japan, and how they mobilize knowledge across operations located in different countries and generate product innovation. With these requirements, I draw our sample from a population of 43 firms, which gives us a response rate of 76.7%.

Based on the analysis of knowledge creation of the Ford Explorer 2002 model, for each company, I selected the largest customer service center in terms of employees located in the USA. I identified these centers using the Directory of Corporate Affiliations (1998). I chose the customer service organization because it is the gatekeeper linking firm's external markets and internal knowledge and activities. As in the case of new knowledge creation for innovation of the Ford Explorer 2002, smaller customer service centers based in Venezuela, Saudi Arabia, and in the United States provide knowledge about the preferences of their customers to the largest customer service center located in Dearborn, Michigan. The center then shares this knowledge with R&D, production, and sales marketing to create new knowledge. The organizations in this study had at least three functions represented: sales/marketing, customer service, and engineering linking to the R&D and manufacturing organizations.

In each customer service center, I randomly selected a set of cross-functional project teams. These teams had to meet two criteria. First, at least three functions were represented:

customer service, engineering (e.g. R&D or manufacturing) and sales/marketing or manufacturing. Second, the project team's main objective was to transform specific external customer feedback obtained from the firm's worldwide operations about their products into an innovation. For example, one project team in a photo imaging firm worked on developing a new camera that had been losing \$8mn per year for the last 8 years, another team in an automobile company redesigned a compact car after finding out that though this product sells in Europe it underperformed in the South American market, while another team in a computer company dealt with developing a new model of personal computers because it has been underperforming in the academic market.

Data Collection

The team-level independent variables were collected from the project team leaders and members, and for the dependent variables, data were collected from the project managers. I approached the company through the vice presidents of customer services and/or sales/marketing who identified and introduced me to the project managers. For each company the project manager was then asked to provide a list of names of projects and the team leaders that supervised them. The list contained both successful and unsuccessful projects. Successful projects were those that generated new knowledge and completed their tasks. Moreover, the quality of their completed projects vary in quality, in terms of customer satisfaction with the innovation, speed-to-market of that innovation, and efficiency in terms of resources used. For unsuccessful projects, they ranged from those that did not complete the project and the team dissolved due to complication with the lack of knowledge sharing and misunderstanding, to those that completed the project but the innovation did not satisfy customers, and/or, speed-to-market was not quickly enough as scheduled, and the use of resources was well above what was budgeted by top management.

Based on this list, we randomly selected five team leaders to take a survey. On each survey the name of the project was labeled so that they knew which project they were answering the questions about. Out of 190 project-team leaders sampled, we received 182 responses giving us a response rate of 95.8%. However, after collecting data on the rest of the team members for these projects, only 99 teams completed the surveys. Therefore, the response rate went down to 60%. In order to minimize team response bias about their projects, project managers were asked to evaluate the outcomes of these projects, which is consistent with the new product development team research (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992, Keller, 2001).

Variables and Measures

Dependent variables. The capability to create new knowledge is represented by firm's project performance, since capability is an intangible that is not measurable directly but only through its effects (Godfrey & Hill, 1995). Of the four outcomes analyzed, three (product innovation, speed-to-market, and customer satisfaction) are based on a five-point Likert scale. For variables consisting of multiple measures, I used factor analysis and report their reliability scores indicated by the cronbach's alpha. All variables have cronbach's alpha >0.70, thus providing adequate reliability for predictor tests and hypothesized measures of a construct (Nunnally, 1978). Product innovation is measured using five items, the extent to which project managers agreed that the outcome of the project resulted in (1) a new product design that is greatly different from the previous model, (2) new design meets higher level of manufacturability, (3) new design meets customer services' specifications, (4) new design meets sales/marketing strategy, (5) new design is more user friendly than the previous model) ($\alpha = 0.82$). Speed-to-market is measured using three items (1) new product was launched on time as expected by customers, (2) new product was launched on time as expected by management, (3) new product was launched on time as

expected by the team ($\alpha = 0.84$). Efficiency was measured by three items, the extent to which project managers agreed that the project team met the budget in terms of (1) man hours, (2) engineering hours, and (3) financial resources (excluding man hours) used ($\alpha = 0.92$).

Independent variables. Internal knowledge sharing frequency is measured by eight items on interaction frequency among team members specifically to share knowledge about the project using (1a) face-to-face meetings, (1b), the extent to which in these meetings knowledge shared was useful in project accomplishment; (2a) face-to-face meetings informally with only certain team members, (2b), the extent to which knowledge shared in these meetings was useful for project accomplishment; (3a) phone conversations, (3b) the extent to which these conversations were useful for project accomplishment; (4a) electronic mail, (4b) the extent to which knowledge that was shared by team members was useful for project accomplishment. The scale is (5=daily, 4=More than once a week, 3=Once every 1-2 weeks, 2=Once every 2-3 weeks, 1=Once every 3-4 weeks). The reliability score has a cronbach's alpha of 0.83. External knowledge sharing frequency is measured by how frequently team members interacted with people outside the team specifically to share knowledge about the project using (1a) face-to-face meetings (5=daily, 4=More than once a week, 3=Once every 1-2 weeks, 2=Once every 2-3 weeks, 1=Once every 3-4 weeks), and (1b) the extent to which knowledge exchanged in these meetings were useful for project accomplishment (5 = most useful, 4 = very useful, 3 = useful, 2 = somewhat useful; 1 = not useful); (2a) phone conversations, and (2b) the extent to which these conversations were useful for project accomplishment; (3a) electronic mail, and (3b) the extent to which these email messages were useful for project accomplishment. The cronbach's alpha for this composite is 0.77. Common knowledge among team members is measured by the total amount of overlapping knowledge among core engineering team members, based on their past and current work

experience. The reason is that field study suggests that firms in the United States that provides any cross-functional training and development tend to do so informally and unsystematically, and only with some of their engineers. One of the reasons is that it is easier for engineers to acquire knowledge in sales/marketing, customer services, and even production, but not the other way around. For each overlapping, a value of 1 was given.

Team development is measured using a 5-point Likert scale on the extent to which the team agreed that they received training specifically for working on the project as an initial step to their teamwork. Project team reward is measured by the extent to which team members agree that project team outcome had any impact on team members' (1) salary increase, (2) bonus payment, (3) promotion, and (4) job assignment ($\alpha = 0.78$). Membership selection based on length of tenure was measured using a 5-point scale on the extent to which team members were selected based on how long they have been with the company.

Control variables. The control variables are team membership selection based on overlapping knowledge (Madhavan & Grover, 1998) measured as the extent to which team members were selected to work on the project based on their prior cross-functional work experiences. Functional diversity is controlled by research design (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992b; Keller, 2001). National diversity of team members was controlled for using the entropy-based diversity index (Teachman, 1980). Tenure diversity was measured by taking the standard variation and divided it by the mean of each team (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992). Moreover, management support for the project is also controlled as previous studies (e.g. Clark & Wheelwright, 1992), despite the lack of empirical support, has an impact on project outcomes. Consistent with the new product development team research, I controlled for team size and prior shared experience working on team. Size ranges from 5-12 members. However, for each team we collected data

only from five core team members, defined as those who were involved with the project from beginning to end. There were team members that played minor role. For example, many companies in the sample had legal experts on all of their project teams. However, the team leaders did not consider them as core members in the creation of the product. They act as legal advisors for product liability. This study also controlled for organizational context by using company dummies.

Methods of Analysis

I use both the canonical correlation and the ordinary least squares regression analyses to test the hypotheses. The canonical correlation is used, because it can assess the relationship between two sets of variables. It is appropriate when any single criterion variable taken in isolation is at best indicative of only a part of the overall relationship (Bolch and Huang, 1974; Lambert and Durand, 1975; Wherry, 1984). I then use the ordinary least squares regression to test the hypotheses.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The correlation between internal and external knowledge sharing is $r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$. The correlation between internal and external knowledge sharing with common knowledge, is relatively low, $r = 0.31$, $p < 0.05$ and $r = 0.26$, $p < 0.05$, respectively. The relatively small correlation coefficients between the independent variables suggest they are distinct from one another; thus, they will be treated independently in this analysis.

Insert Table 1 about here

Among the dependent variables, we see that customer satisfaction and speed-to-market are relatively highly correlated ($r = 0.55$, $p < 0.01$). Because both variables are dependent variables, a canonical analysis helps us establish that the predictors as a set are able to explain a significant amount of variation in these outcomes of capability simultaneously as a criterion set. If the predictors are unable to explain a significant amount of variation in these dependent variables as a set, subsequent analyses of each dependent variable are not permitted. This protects against explaining repeatedly the same variation shared by correlated dependent variables.

Table 2 presents a canonical analysis of the variation explained in the outcomes of the capability to create knowledge simultaneously as a set. The predictors explain 56.25% (the canonical correlation squared) of the variation in the combined set of dependent variables.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 3 presents the results from testing the project team-level factors, hypotheses H1a-H1c. The results show that H1a, H1b, and H1c are supported. Project team internal and external knowledge sharing frequency, and common knowledge support different measures of project performance, which is a proxy for the knowledge creation capability. Model 2 shows that internal knowledge sharing frequency, external knowledge sharing frequency, and team common knowledge have a positive effect on product innovation. Common knowledge, however, seems to have stronger effect followed by internal knowledge sharing frequency and external knowledge sharing frequency. For efficiency in terms of resources used, I find similar effects. For speed-to-market of the new knowledge, similar factors facilitate this outcome, however, internal knowledge sharing frequency seems to be a stronger predictor than common knowledge followed by external knowledge sharing. For customer satisfaction, external knowledge sharing seems to

be a stronger supporter, followed by internal knowledge sharing. Common knowledge also has a positive relationship with this outcome. Although common knowledge among team members seem to be strong supporter of all measures of project performance, there is a decreasing return on product innovation and customer satisfaction, which means that up to a point, common knowledge has a negative effect on these outcomes. One explanation is that for this type of task, product innovation that achieves customer satisfaction, it requires a diverse set of deep functional knowledge and expertise as well as some knowledge in common.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 presents the results from testing hypotheses H2a-H2e. The results show that all hypotheses are supported. Team development facilitates internal and external knowledge sharing frequency. Project teams that receive project team development are also more likely to engage in knowledge sharing that is both internal and external to the team than project teams that do not receive the development. Interestingly, project team reward lead to higher internal or external knowledge sharing frequency as theory of motivation suggests, however, lower than team development, which is a team socialization process. What is even more interesting is that team membership selection based on cross-functional common knowledge does not ensure common knowledge among team members. One possible explanation for this could be that project team leaders or managers who select team members do not have accurate information about the knowledge sets based on job experiences of individuals they select. Selection on tenure with the company better predicts common knowledge among team members. However, the control, team size, also predicts common knowledge among team members.

Insert Table 4 about here

The results show that project team factors support the development of knowledge creation capability as measured by project performance. Among the project team factors, project team internal knowledge sharing frequency facilitates product innovation and efficiency in terms of resources used in creating new knowledge for product innovation, speed-to-market, and customer satisfaction with new knowledge. External knowledge sharing frequency also supports new knowledge creation for product innovation, efficiency, speed-to-market, and customer satisfaction with the innovation. Common knowledge between manufacturing and R&D engineering team members has a decreasing return on product innovation and customer satisfaction with the innovation (new knowledge), but has a positive effect on efficiency and speed-to-market. This finding suggests that although overlapping knowledge facilitates understanding and thus knowledge conversion, up to a point, it minimizes the creative abrasion that is also necessary for product innovation that meets customer preferences.

Among the project team management practices, team development facilitates the development of project team internal and external knowledge sharing more so than reward for project performance. This difference may be explained by the fact that previous studies did not study team initial socialization, which is development, and reward together. Project team membership selection based on tenure with the company rather than overlapping knowledge among team members, better ensures common knowledge team members. One of the explanations for this finding could be that companies in the United States where they do not systematically develop their employees to have some overlapping knowledge managers or team leaders that formed the teams did not have accurate information about team members' prior job experiences.

One way to ensure some common knowledge is to select members based on tenure with the company.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this study I take the view that firms are distributed knowledge systems and empirically explain the factors that facilitate new knowledge creation in firms, which has been lacking in the knowledge-based view (Eisenhardt and Santos, 2002). The paper accomplishes this by integrating the knowledge-based view of the firm to the new product development team literature, because I view this literature as being about new knowledge creation though specifically for product innovation, that provides us with some explanation about the factors that facilitate new knowledge creation. This study indicates that in developing the capability to create new knowledge, firms need to manage individuals such that they have the willingness to interact to share knowledge, which facilitates knowledge mobilization in organization, and develop them to have the understanding of each other's knowledge, which would facilitates knowledge creation. Therefore, both knowledge mobilization and creation should be considered separately as they are supported by different integrative mechanisms. The willingness of individuals to interact to share knowledge encourages team-internal and external knowledge sharing and common knowledge among individuals promotes understanding. Surprisingly, among the project team practices, team development has a larger impact than reward on project performance by facilitating their willingness to interact to share knowledge as seen by their internal and external knowledge sharing frequency. Moreover, team membership selection based on company tenure better predicts common knowledge sets among team members than selection based on common knowledge sets. This common knowledge promotes understanding among individuals.

This paper makes contribution to both theory and practice. To the knowledge-based view it shows how the capability to create new knowledge might be developed in firms by first making the distinction between knowledge mobilization and new knowledge creation and suggesting that it requires the willingness of individuals based in different parts of the organization to interact to share knowledge and have some understanding of each other's knowledge. While knowledge mobilization requires individuals' willingness to interact to share knowledge through the building of social ties or the use of economic incentives, new knowledge creation also requires individuals' understanding of each other's knowledge. In the process, this study clarifies the level and unit of analysis of the organizational capabilities literature based in the knowledge-based view. It argues that much of this literature considers firm as the level of analysis and the substructures, especially project teams, as the unit of analysis. This is a useful distinction because perhaps we can manage the substructures, in this case, project teams, in order to develop the capability to create new knowledge.

In terms of practice, this study suggests that firms that compete on new knowledge creation may need to focus on the factors that facilitate both the willingness of individuals to interact to share knowledge and understanding of each other's knowledge. Project team development rather than reward has a stronger effect on the willingness to interact to share knowledge as seen by their higher frequency of internal and external knowledge. This practice entails teaching employees how to communicate with people from outside their functions and how to organize their teamwork processes, after a knowledge-creation task has been defined and individuals are organized into project teams to create knowledge. Team development should be the initial step to their knowledge creation process. Third, common knowledge between manufacturing and R&D employees supports many outcomes of this capability. Therefore, some

employees may need to be developed at the organization level prior to team participation, so that they have some overlapping knowledge between these two parts of the organization. Moreover, organizations may also need to track employees' job experience, and in the process of project team formation, the team leader or managers in charge of selection should use this information.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. 1970. Knowledge sharing networks in R&D laboratories. *R&D Management*, 1: 14-21.
- Allen, T. 1977. *Managing the flow of technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ancona, D., & Caldwell, D. 1999. *Compose teams to assure successful boundary activity*. Working paper no. 4097, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Ancona, D., & Caldwell, D. 1992a. Demography and design: Predictors of new product team performance. *Organization Science*, 3: 321-341.
- Ancona, D., & Caldwell, D. 1992b. Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37: 634-55.
- Aoki, M. 1988. *Information, incentives, and bargaining in the Japanese economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolch, B. W. & Huang, C. J. 1974. *Multivariate statistical methods for business and economics*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Clark, K. & Fujimoto, T. 1991. *Product development performance: Strategy, organization, and management in the world auto industry*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Clark, K., & Wheelwright, S. 1992. Organizing and leading “heavyweight” development teams. *California Management Review*, 34:9-28.
- Dierickx P. A., & Cool K. 1989. Asset stock accumulation and the sustainability of competitive advantage. *Management Science*, 35: 1504-11.
- Directory of corporate affiliations. 1998. *Directory of corporate affiliations Vol. IIV*. New Providence, NJ: National Register Publishing.

- Economist*. 2000. The shredding of Jac Nasser. September 9: 82.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Santos, F. M. 2002. Knowledge-based view: A new theory of strategy? In A. Pettigrew, H. Thomas, and R. Whittington. *Handbook of strategy and management*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Fiol, C. M. 1996. Squeezing harder doesn't always work: Continuing the search for consistency in innovation research. *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 1012-1021.
- Foss, N. J. 1997. Resources and strategy: A brief overview of themes and contributions. In Foss, N. J. (Ed.), *Resources, firms and strategies: A reader in the resource-based perspective*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Foss, N. J., Knudsen, C. & Montgomery, C. A. 1995. An Exploration of common ground: integrating evolutionary and strategic theories of the firm. In C. A. Montgomery (Ed.), *Resource-based and evolutionary theories of the firm: towards a synthesis* Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Godfrey, P. C., & Hill, C. 1995. The Problem of Unobservables in Strategic Management Research', *Strategic Management Journal*, 16: 519-533.
- Grant, R. 1996a. Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments: Organizational capability as knowledge integration. *Organization Science*, 7: 375-399.
- Grant, R. 1996b. Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(Winter Special Issue): 109-122.
- Griffin, A., & Hauser, J. 1992. Patterns of knowledge sharings among marketing, engineering and manufacturing - A comparison between two new product development teams. *Management Science*, 38: 360-373.

- Hansen, Morton. 1999. The search-transfer problem: The role of weak ties in sharing knowledge across organization subunits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44: 82-111.
- Hoover's. 1999. *Hoover's Handbook of World Business*. Reference Press: Austin, TX.
- Iansiti, M. 1998. *Technology integration: Making critical choices in a dynamic world*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Keller, R. T. 2001. Cross-functional project groups in research and new product development: diversity, communications, job stress, and outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44: 547-555.
- Kerr, S. 1975. On the folly of rewarding A, while hoping for B. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18: 769-783.
- Kogut, B., & Zander, U. 1992. Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities and the replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3: 383-97.
- Kouky, S. 2002. Ford Explorer XLT 4x4. *Machine Design*, 74: 95.
- Lambert, Z. V. & Durand, R. M. 1975. Some precautions in using canonical analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 12: 468-475.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. 1967. *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
- Leonard, D., & Sensiper, S. 1998. The role of tacit knowledge in-group innovation. *California Management Review*, 40: 112-132.
- Leonard-Barton, D. 1995. *Wellsprings of knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

- Madhavan, R., & Grover, R. 1998. From embedded knowledge to embodied knowledge: New product development as knowledge management. *Journal of Marketing*, 62: 1-12.
- Menon, A., Jaworski, B. J., and Kohli, A. K. 1997. Product quality: Impact of interdepartmental interactions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25: 187-200.
- Milgrom, P., & Roberts, J. 1992. *Economics, organization and management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nahapiet, J., & Ghoshal, S. 1998. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 242-266.
- Nonaka I. 1994. A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5: 14-37.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. 1995. *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nunnally, J. C. 1978. *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Hamel, G. 1990. The core competence of the corporation. *Harvard Business Review* (May-June): 79-91.
- Roth, G. L., & Kleiner, A. 2000. *Car Launch: the Human Side of Managing Change*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Schein, E. 1996. *Three cultures of management: The key to organizational learning in the 21st century*. Mimeo, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- Souder, W. E. 1987. *Managing new product innovations*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Subramaniam, M., & Venkatraman, N. 2001. Determinants of Transnational New Product Development Capability: Testing the Influence of Transferring and Deploying Tacit Overseas Knowledge. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 359-378.
- Szulanski, G. 1996. Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17 (Winter Special Issue): 27-43.
- Teachman, J. D. 1980. Analysis of population diversity. *Sociological methods and research*, 8: 341-362.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. 1997. Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 509-533.
- Takeishi, A. 2001. Bridging inter- and intra-firm boundaries: Management of supplier involvement in automobile product development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 403-433.
- Tsai, W. 2002. Social structure of "coopetition" within a multiunit organization: Coordination, competition, and intraorganizational knowledge sharing, *Organization Science*, 13: 179-190.
- Tsoukas, H. 1996. The firm as a distributed knowledge system: A constructionist approach. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17 (Winter Special Issue): 11-25.
- Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. 2000. *Enabling Knowledge Creation: How to Unlock the Mystery of Tacit Knowledge and Release the Power of Innovation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Wageman, R., & Baker, G. 1997. Incentives and cooperation: The joint effects of task and reward interdependence on group performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18: 139-158.
- Wernerfelt, B. 1997. Forward. In N. Foss (Ed.), *Resources firms and strategies: A reader in the resource-based perspective*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wherry, R. J. 1984. *Contributions to correlational analysis*. New York: Academic Press.

TABLES AND FIGURES

TABLE 1

Descriptive statistics and correlation analysis

Variables	Mean	Stdev.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Product innovation	2.74	1.50	--														
2. Efficiency	1.75	0.64	0.22	--													
3. Speed-to-market	3.32	1.02	0.01	0.14	--												
4. Customer satisfaction	3.73	0.93	0.04	0.13	0.55***	--											
5. Internal knowledge sharing	3.29	1.01	0.44**	0.43**	0.05	0.14	--										
6. External knowledge sharing	2.26	1.36	0.51***	-0.03	0.10	0.35*	0.43**	--									
7. Common knowledge	3.46	3.36	0.47**	0.44**	0.45**	-0.24	0.31*	0.26*	--								
8. Development	2.87	1.31	0.38*	0.03	0.46**	0.26	0.40**	0.42**	-0.08	--							
9. Reward	4.32	4.07	0.17	0.45**	-0.05	0.64***	-0.15	0.20	0.64***	0.33**	--						
10. Selection on tenure	3.06	1.80	0.22	-0.12	-0.17	-0.11	-0.04	-0.16	0.43**	0.07	0.25*	--					
11. C-Selection on common knowledge	2.78	1.03	-0.18	0.08	-0.41**	-0.31*	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.30*	0.27	0.15	--				
12. C-National diversity	0.57	0.42	0.68***	-0.36	0.52***	0.42**	0.19	0.27*	0.16	0.22	0.28	0.12	0.12	--			
13. C-Tenure diversity	7.40	4.27	0.33*	-0.18	-0.15	-0.18	-0.29	-0.21	-0.36*	-0.26*	-0.21	0.42***	0.45**	0.47**	--		
14. C-Size	9.32	3.06	-0.15	-0.04	-0.41**	0.13	-0.09	-0.06	0.44**	-0.10	0.10	-0.06	-0.06	0.14	0.37*	--	
15. C-Prior shared experience	0.14	0.38	-0.38**	-0.13	-0.30*	0.00	-0.08	-0.03	0.01	0.07	0.08	-0.09	-0.02	0.18	0.29*	-0.06	--
16. C-Management support	4.57	0.68	0.03	-0.05	0.13	0.04	0.04	-0.01	-0.10	0.03	-0.10	0.05	0.07	0.11	0.38*	0.02	0.00

Note: N= 99 (project teams).

*? < 0.05

** ? < 0.01

*** ? < 0.001

TABLE 2

Canonical Analysis

Variable	Standardized canonical coefficients
KNOWLEDGE CREATION CAPABILITY	
Product innovation	0.48
Speed-to-market	0.37
Customer satisfaction	0.45
Efficiency	0.44
TEAM PROCESS AND CHARACTERISTICS	
Internal knowledge sharing	0.39
External knowledge sharing	0.38
Common knowledge	0.42
Canonical correlation	0.75
Df	6/338
F-ratio	17.65***
*** p < 0.001	

TABLE 3

The effect of project team factors on team's capability to mobilize and create knowledge (N = 99)

Model	Product innovation		Efficiency		Speed-to-market		Customer satisfaction	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Internal knowledge sharing frequency	--	0.56 ** (0.19)	--	0.68 *** (0.22)	--	0.82 *** (0.11)	--	0.49 ** (0.15)
External knowledge sharing frequency	--	0.42 *** (0.12)	--	0.51 * (0.23)	--	0.46 ** (0.10)	--	0.61 *** (0.14)
Common knowledge	--	0.82 *** (0.11)	--	0.69 *** (0.19)	--	0.75 *** (0.11)	--	0.47 * (0.16)
Common knowledge ²	--	-0.84 *** (0.19)	--	0.43 * (0.18)	--	0.44 * (0.07)	--	-0.29 * (0.12)
Selection on tenure	--	0.36 ** (0.14)	--	-0.58 * (0.23)	--	0.25 * (0.12)	--	0.73 *** (0.19)
C-Selection on functional common knowledge	0.24 (0.25)	0.16 (0.09)	0.22 (0.14)	0.31 (0.29)	0.29 (0.61)	0.21 (0.13)	0.42 * (0.19)	0.16 (0.18)
C-National diversity	0.61 * (0.23)	0.36 * (0.15)	0.39 (0.48)	0.35 (0.22)	0.64 (0.53)	0.42 (0.39)	0.49 ** (0.11)	0.42 * (0.18)
C-Size	0.55 ** (0.11)	-0.16 (0.65)	-0.12 (0.32)	0.35 (0.38)	0.22 (0.21)	-0.39 *** (0.08)	0.18 (0.11)	0.19 (0.12)
C-Prior shared team experience	-0.34 * (0.07)	-0.22 ** (0.07)	-0.18 (0.14)	-0.22 (0.18)	0.55 ** (0.21)	-0.19 * (0.07)	0.41 ** (0.13)	-0.14 (0.12)
C-Management support	-0.15 (0.22)	0.02 (0.07)	0.27 (0.31)	0.63 * (0.29)	0.44 ** (0.07)	0.02 (0.08)	0.38 * (0.17)	0.57 ** (0.12)
C-Company (32 dummies)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F	1.78	5.96***	1.68	5.23**	2.73	5.88***	1.96	4.78**
R ²	0.09	0.36	0.11	0.33	0.15	0.29	0.10	0.41
Adjusted R ²	--	0.28	--	0.23	--	0.26	--	0.32

*? < 0.05

** ? < 0.01

*** ? < 0.001

TABLE 4

The effects of project team management practices on knowledge sharing and functional common knowledge (N = 99)

Model	Internal knowledge sharing frequency		External knowledge Sharing Frequency		Common knowledge	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Development	--	0.89 *** (0.27)	--	0.67 *** (0.15)	--	-
Reward	--	0.26 ** (0.08)	--	0.44 * (0.17)	--	-
Selection on tenure	--	-0.16 (0.11)	--	0.54 ** (0.21)	--	0.88 *** (0.24)
C-Selection on common knowledge	0.42 (0.35)	0.57 (0.62)	0.21 (0.28)	0.19 (0.09)	0.33 (0.25)	0.31 (0.29)
C-National diversity	0.27 (0.22)	0.76 (0.51)	0.72 ** (0.28)	0.69 *** (0.17)	0.42 (0.23)	0.53 (0.35)
C-Size	-0.31 ** (0.10)	-0.32 (0.17)	0.53 (0.36)	0.42 *** (0.08)	0.41 *** (0.10)	0.51 *** (0.19)
C-Prior shared team experience	0.26 (0.19)	0.42 ** (0.07)	0.27 (0.16)	0.03 (0.07)	0.10 (0.09)	0.10 (0.09)
C-Management support	0.44 * (0.19)	-0.17 (0.15)	-0.19 (0.11)	0.09 (0.08)	-0.14 (0.09)	-0.14 (0.09)
C-Company (32 dummies)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
F	4.96 *	5.89 **	2.66	5.43 **	3.11 *	5.64 **
R ²	0.11	0.33	0.09	0.29	0.17	0.31
Adjusted R ²	--	0.28	--	0.31	--	0.29

* ? < 0.05

** ? < 0.01

*** ? < 0.001