INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND: CREATING KNOWLEDGE IN INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECT TEAM SITUATIONS

Designing a product or service does not form a complete and coherent body of knowledge that can be precisely documented or even articulated by a single individual. Rather, it is a form of knowing that exists only through the interaction among various collective actors (Gherardi & Nicolini, 2000). Existing literature (Kanter, 1988; Nonaka, 1994) has highlighted a need for the development of a diverse workforce if knowledge creation is to be promoted and sustained. This literature suggests that a diverse set of resources (experts with different backgrounds and abilities) provides a broad knowledge base at the individual level, offering greater potential for knowledge creation.

Sahlin-Andersson (1998) viewed projects as local arenas for knowledge creation, as individuals possessing different experience and skills work together to solve a common task within a limited timeframe. Through collaboration, new technical knowledge and knowledge for organizing the project are developed over time. March et al. (1991) argued that organizations learn from experience to improve future performance. By the same token, projects can be used as a medium for organizational learning, where knowledge and experience gained in one project can be transferred and utilized in the next. This strategy does not aim solely to save time and money, but also to avoid “reinventing the wheel”, which is something that occurs frequently in every new project. Penrose (1959) argued that utilizing and employing experience and the knowledge thus created makes an organization grow.

Conceptually, a team can be viewed as a socially constructed phenomenon or linking mechanism that integrates individuals and organizations (Horvath et al., 1996). A multidisciplinary team is defined by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) as “a self-managed, self-organised team in which members from various functional departments, and/or areas of expertise, work together to accomplish a common goal” (p. 85). The primary goal of the multidisciplinary composition (see Figure 1) is to marry diverse bodies of knowledge in a way that forces out a synergistic knowledge outcome that is innovative, contextualized, difficult to imitate, and, as such, has strategic value. For the most part, project team tasks are nonrepetitive in nature and involve the application of considerable knowledge, judgment, and expertise.

The advantage of adopting multidisciplinary project teams is that they are quicker in integrating the expert knowledge of different functions, for example, design, construction, property management, marketing, and so forth. Cross-functional project teams with mutual accountability and collective work products have been found to decrease development time and increase product quality (Van de Ven, 1986; Wheel-

Figure 1. A multidisciplinary composition of team members with diverse knowledge, judgment, and expertise
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Multidisciplinary project teams create a “task culture”, facilitating close linkages and direct personal contacts between different functions (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990). These close connections are necessary, as new product development by its very nature includes uncertainty about the potential market response and about new technology (Henke, Krachtenberg & Lyons, 1993). The multidisciplinary project team can be viewed as an unusual team arrangement primarily because it is composed of professionals from various disciplines who take pride in their fields of expertise. They are committed to the basic assumptions of their paradigms, and they perceive their roles in the team as representing their knowledge bases in the best possible way.

KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN PROJECT TEAMS

To enhance competitiveness and meet organizational goals, organizations need to ensure that people share both tacit and explicit knowledge. The increased sharing of knowledge raises the likelihood of new knowledge being created, tending to support valuable innovation (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). Though organizations can codify some of the knowledge people use, it is easy to find cases or examples that do not fit the codified knowledge of the organization. This unarticulated knowledge requires communication among people in the organization. Orr (1996) found that photocopier technicians often searched for solutions beyond their manuals. He explained that “the expertise vital to such contingent and extemporaneous practice cannot be easily codified” (p. 2). When documentation proves insufficient, people need to access each other’s experience to solve more difficult problems. Orr showed how technicians sometimes use narrative to recount each other’s experience. Technicians might use breakfast or lunch meetings to share knowledge. Other accounts of knowledge sharing demonstrate how workers use computer-mediated communication. For example, Constant, Sproull, and Kiesler (1996) showed how people use a computer-mediated network to seek help and advice. Similarly, Hargadon and Sutton (1997) explained how product designers search for knowledge by sending out pleas for help via electronic mail. In both cases, communication is the key to sharing knowledge.

Knowledge sharing relies on reaching a shared understanding of the underlying knowledge, in terms of not just the content but also the context of the knowledge, or “Ba”, to use Nonaka and Konno’s (1998) term. Exchanging information represents only a partial view of knowledge sharing activity. The essence lies in unveiling and synthesizing paradigmatic differences through social interaction.

Many definitions of the word paradigm exist. Neufeldt and Guralnik (1988) defined it first as “a pattern, example, or model” and second as “an overall concept accepted by most people in an intellectual community... because of its effectiveness in explaining a complex process, idea, or set of data” (p. 979). Kuhn (1970, p. 181), who popularized the term, provided two definitions for a paradigm. In the primary sense of the word, a paradigm is a “disciplinary matrix”, the ordered elements of which are held by the practitioners of a discipline. According to this definition, a paradigm includes symbolic generalizations (laws and definitions), shared beliefs, and shared values. In an alternate use, Kuhn (1970, p. 187) defined paradigms in a more circumscribed manner as “exemplars” or “shared examples”. More recent work by Boland and Tenkasi (1995) indicated the use of the concept of “perspective taking” and “perspective making” to resolve paradigmatic differences through appreciating individuals’ different paradigms. By synthesizing the various definitions and insights, a paradigm as used in this chapter, is defined as a team perspective or belief which is collectively constructed and accepted by members of the team. This definition reflects the perspective of social construction as well as the opportunity for paradigmatic differences to be resolved through social interaction between members in collective settings, such as teams or organizations.

Knowledge sharing is not constrained to exchanges among and across the employees of a company. It can occur between employees and customers, or between organizations or firms in entirely different industries (von Hippel, 1988). Some of the very important knowledge identified in a survey among knowledge-intensive businesses includes customer, competitor, and product knowledge (Skyrme & Amidon, 1997). The more knowledge is shared about the needs of