Fluid Teams and Knowledge Retrieval: Scaling Service Operations

Melissa A. Valentine, Tom Fangyun Tan, Bradley R. Staats, Amy C. Edmondson

Please scroll down for article—it is on subsequent pages

Fluid Teams and Knowledge Retrieval: Scaling Service Operations

Melissa A. Valentine,[a] Tom Fangyun Tan,[b] Bradley R. Staats,[c] Amy C. Edmondson[d]

[a] Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305; [b] Cox Business School, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275;
[c] University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599; [d] Harvard Business School, Boston, Massachusetts 02163
Contact: mav@stanford.edu (MAV); ttan@cox.smu.edu, http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1973-6515 (TFT); bstaats@unc.edu,
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2674-5831 (BRS); aedmondson@hbs.edu (ACE)

Abstract. To scale service operations requires retrieving knowledge across the organization. However, prior work highlights that individuals on the periphery of organizational knowledge networks may struggle to access useful knowledge at work. A knowledge repository has the potential to help peripheral individuals gain access to valuable knowledge because it is universally available and can be used without social interaction. However, for it to successfully serve this equalizing function, those on the periphery of the organizational knowledge networks must actually use it, possibly overcoming barriers to doing so. In this paper, we develop a multilevel model of knowledge retrieval in teams to explore how individuals on the periphery of knowledge networks—because of their inexperience, location, lack of social capital, gender, or role—access knowledge from such a knowledge repository. Unexpectedly, we find that individuals whose experience and position already provide access to vital knowledge use a knowledge repository more frequently than individuals on the organizational periphery. We argue that this occurs because the knowledge repository—despite its appearance of equivalent accessibility—is actually more accessible to central than to peripheral players. Thus, knowledge retrieval is not driven primarily by the need to overcome limited access to other knowledge sources. Rather knowledge retrieval is facilitated when actors know how to reap value from the knowledge repository, which ironically improves with increasing access to other sources of knowledge. We conclude that a knowledge repository is unlikely to scale service operations without additional intervention.

1. Introduction

In 2015, the Indian information technology (IT)-enabled services industry generated an estimated revenue of $146 billion, up from $105 million in 1989 (Athreye 2005a, NASSCOM 2015). A compound annual growth rate of over 30% for more than 25 years is a remarkable industrial success story. The causes of success are myriad. Many important factors arose outside of the firms: changes in Indian governmental policy in 1991 encouraged IT exports; information systems became more prevalent in organizations; communication costs decreased because of innovations such as the internet; and globalization created new, global value chains (Arora et al. 2001, Athreye 2005b, Friedman 2005).

However, the rise of the Indian IT-enabled services industry was not simply a story of being in the right place at the right time. The major players in the industry made significant investments in their own capabilities to gradually move their way up the global value chain (Arora and Asundi 1999, Ethiraj et al. 2005, Staats et al. 2011). When organizational performance depends on how knowledge is used, scaling a global service operation is particularly challenging. Globally distributed employees often lack ready access to knowledgeable colleagues and struggle to retrieve knowledge across geographic and temporal distance (Cummings et al. 2009, O'Leary and Cummings 2007). In addition, many individuals in developing markets are relatively early in their careers and are therefore not only removed from knowledgeable senior mentors, but also have less personal experience on which to draw in their daily work (Levenson 2012, Ready et al. 2008). Global organizations may want their employees to learn the most salient organizational information, but people early in their careers, or in remote offices, are likely to be on the periphery of knowledge networks (Singh et al. 2010).

IT has been shown to offer promise in improving productivity (Bartel et al. 2007, Brynjolfsson and Hitt 1996). One such investment undertaken by each of the leading Indian IT-enabled services firms was the building of electronic knowledge repository (KR) systems. A KR offers a practical solution to the challenges of making knowledge available to people who might otherwise lack access to relevant expertise (Davenport and Prusak 1998, Stein and Zwass 1995). To create a KR, experts from across the firm codify best practices and useful insights, which are stored in an information system that is made available to all employees. These KRs are available to every employee across time zones and continents and could thus function as a knowledge-access equalizer. A well-designed KR could help individuals access knowledge they would otherwise lack and help organizations manage the challenge of making knowledge available to employees independent of their social and geographic positions.

However, the presence of a KR alone will not solve the problem of knowledge access for those at the periphery of the organization unless people use it. Previous research has examined how the characteristics of the stored knowledge, such as employee perceptions of its quality, influence its use (Hansen and Haas 2001, Kulkarni et al. 2006), but less is known about how knowledge network position, such as central versus peripheral, affects knowledge retrieval. In this paper, we explore whether individuals on the organizational periphery take advantage of KRs or if KRs function more to enrich individuals whose experience and position already provide them better access to other knowledge sources.

We obtained archival data on knowledge retrieval at Wipro Technologies, a global outsourced provider of software services. Repository use was tracked for 10,703 individuals in 481 software project development teams on a per click basis. We linked these empirical data with other Wipro databases, including archival team and project characteristics. Our results show that—despite the seeming promise of a KR to integrate or equalize peripheral players—the KR instead enriches knowledge access for central players who are already well positioned. Our results suggest that knowledge retrieval is not simply an individual activity based on relative need, but is instead inhibited by an individual's network position. With these findings, we contribute to both the knowledge management and service operations literature. With respect to the former, we show that one's personal network and knowledge search within the defined confines of an information system may be encumbered by peripheral status (Singh et al. 2010). With actual system use data, we are able to show who is most limited. For the service operations literature, we contribute to the burgeoning topic of scaling operations. We find that good systems and

processes are not enough by themselves, but instead, that system designers must address individual challenges if they are to scale successfully.

2. Setting
We developed understanding of our phenomenon at Wipro Technologies, a company operating in the software services industry. Wipro delivers software system development projects to its global client base. Team members rely on access to knowledge to complete their projects (Faraj and Sproull 2000, Huckman and Staats 2011, Huckman et al. 2009), making this an ideal setting for understanding knowledge retrieval.

As mentioned previously, the Indian IT-enabled services industry experienced dramatic growth during the 1990s and 2000s. As revenue grew, so did headcount. From 1993 to 2014, headcount grew at a compound annual growth rate of over 18% (Heeks 2015). At the same time, attrition of software engineers ran anywhere from 10% to 30% annually, depending on the company and the general environment. Companies like Wipro were faced with a very real challenge of how to scale their operations as they hired tens of thousands of employees per year. Leading firms invested significant money in identifying talented engineers—both at universities and from competing firms. Once they were brought into the organizations, firms heavily invested in training and preparing them for the technical roles that they undertook.

However, Wipro and others still faced a considerable challenge when engineers were assigned to project teams to complete their work. Software development projects involve identifying a solution to client requirements, writing the software code to create the solution, and then testing the final product (Boehm 1981). To accomplish this work, it is necessary to draw upon one's own experience and training. However, an individual may not have encountered a given type of problem previously and so needs to turn to others for help. Organizationally, it is suboptimal to create new solutions for previously solved problems. Instead, a company would rather share known, viable solutions, so that others can save time and perhaps develop more innovative approaches.

Traditionally, individuals used their own ties to other employees or resources within a project to solve difficult problems or learn of alternative solutions. In an attempt to stay ahead of (or at least even with) the strong competition from other software services firms (e.g., Accenture, Cognizant, IBM, TCS, and Infosys), Wipro senior management sought to formalize the company's own knowledge management process. With a goal of delivering projects both efficiently and effectively within the constraints of new employees and employee attrition, management focused on capturing

and providing access to previously generated organizational knowledge through an electronic KR. The company had established a knowledge management initiative many years before, but at the time of this research, Wipro launched a new effort to enhance this initiative and invested substantial time and financial resources. Wipro enhanced the interface used for knowledge management (called KNet) and implemented analytic technology to enable the tracking of person-level use of the KR. All employees could download content from the KR and were encouraged to submit content. Submitted content was evaluated and solicited by a knowledge management team to maintain the intended quality standards of the system (the team functioned like the knowledge intermediaries described by Markus 2001). Wipro did not dictate a specific policy on knowledge retrieval during the study period. The content of the KR included a limited amount of reusable software but consisted mainly of documents detailing how the author of the document accomplished a specific task.

Describing how the KR could benefit work on projects, one project manager said,

> There are many different types of documents on KNet. For example, there are case studies of prior projects that talk about benefits, problems, client value, new innovations, and best practices. There are also documents that explain how a specific aspect of a technology or domain works. These include details about solving particular problems, such as the flow of development, steps to follow, and examples.

A different project manager commented, "In a project, we can go to KNet and use it to find best practices. We can look at case studies and see lessons learned and what issues different projects faced. All this helps the team deliver better." As an example, one project manager explained,

> On one project, we had a development activity that took two to three hours. We had to deploy code onto servers at a client location so it could be tested. I realized that by reordering the steps, I could create a simplified process that would do the same work in an hour and fifteen minutes. I posted a document explaining this, and then others [either on his project or other projects] could download it and save time.

Wipro employees learned about KNet during their initial training at the company. Moreover, the knowledge management (KM) team marketed the platform through emails to company personnel and through a link on the company's intranet. In outreach efforts, the KM team focused on how the platform could help engineers on several business drivers, including shorter time to market, client responsiveness, and competency building. Although management believed that all employees could benefit from using the KNet

system, they expected that the system would be particularly valuable to those employees who were not embedded in the firm's existing knowledge network, whom we label as peripheral players, since the system could provide an easy and straightforward way to access the knowledge of others.

We consider five different measures of peripheral status in the knowledge network based on prior literature and the global software services context: inexperience, remote location, limited familiarity with teammates, minority gender status, and front-line status. First, we consider the experience of team members. As noted earlier, the combination of company growth and turnover meant that a large number of engineers had limited firm experience. For example, approximately 67% of workers in our final sample had worked at Wipro for two years or less. Individuals were placed on projects as a function of how their experience set matched to the necessary work. It is important to note that software development projects within the software services space were not the same kind of development as might be found in writing a new software package or a new video game. Instead of being an entirely new creative process, it involved more problem solving to match a solution to the client's requirements. As a result, managers reported that the gap between individuals' needed knowledge and actual knowledge was either comparable for experienced and inexperienced workers, or slightly larger for inexperienced ones. In other words, experienced engineers might work on harder tasks, but they also had more knowledge; they were likely completing work similar to what they had done previously. Finally, managers noted that the technology for development projects was not changing so rapidly that experienced workers were growing obsolete. Rather, experienced workers were most prepared to work on these projects, given their skill sets.

Second, we consider individuals' location. Wipro, like other software services, operated with a global delivery model where engineers were deployed around the world. However, the vast majority of engineers worked out of delivery centers in India (approximately 88% in our final sample). In India, engineers were typically located in large delivery centers with many other workers, creating numerous opportunities for knowledge sharing and interaction. Although the company had many facilities in India, at the time of our data collection, software development projects were typically staffed out of one location. Onsite engineers were deployed to the client locations to work on local systems. These individuals were completing similar work to what was being completed in India. Given that a majority of work was done in places like the United States with 9½–13½ hour time differences, depending on the location and time of year, these onsite engineers

were often isolated with little access to organizational knowledge networks. One project manager explained the need for a KR tool in such a setting by noting that, "When a team is spread out, then KR can be very beneficial. For example, the onshore team can go to KNet to check a code review checklist instead of having to contact someone on the offshore team. This makes code reviews faster and more accurate." During the time of our study, management reported that they tried to deliver as much work from India as possible, given the cost advantage. Engineers were sent onsite when systems required onsite access or when clients requested that. As a result, it is important to control for the client served when examining the effect of location on knowledge retrieval. Finally, we note that engineers located onsite are, on average, more experienced than engineers in offshore facilities. This occurs as new engineers are not typically sent onsite but instead complete work in India before being eligible to go to a client site. Consequently, it is important to control for individual experience when examining the impact of location.

Third, we consider individuals' experience with other teammates. Given the general lack of firm-specific experience, it is not surprising that many individuals did not have experience with the same team members. In our final sample, the median engineer on a project had zero ties with other team members. This lack of interaction could serve as a barrier to knowledge search. However, although 51% of team members had not worked with anyone on a team previously, the other 49% had worked with at least one other team member; the latter may be better positioned to access knowledge.

Fourth, we examine minority gender status. Prior work notes that minority gender status may constrain knowledge search as individuals tend to seek knowledge from others who are of the same gender as them (Singh et al. 2010). In our final sample, only 26% of the engineers were female. Thus, we consider female as the minority gender status.

Finally, we consider role status and access to knowledge networks. Development projects typically used team members in three roles—project engineer, middle manager, and project manager. While the latter two took on management responsibility, project engineers were responsible for execution. In our final sample, 84% of individuals were engineers (nonmanagement). Individuals in management roles could be advantaged in the organizational knowledge network, as their status may help them secure access to knowledgeable experts and lead them to interact with these people.

3. Hypothesis Development
In this section, we investigate why the perspective that a knowledge repository might eliminate the knowledge gap between more and less connected individuals could be wrong. In particular, we theorize about how

the conditions under which peripheral players' work both increases their need for knowledge access and also, ironically—and unfortunately—makes them less able to use a KR.

We begin by considering what it means to be core or peripheral within a firm's knowledge network. A long line of research has examined how networks, for knowledge or social relationships, often take a "small-world" structure whereby individuals can connect to others through a relatively small number of connections (Milgram 1967, Travers and Milgram 1969). Although subsequent research has supported the general small-world hypothesis, research has also revealed that unit-level differences may limit individuals' ability or inclination to cross over different sub-groups (Fleming et al. 2007, Kleinfeld 2002). Singh et al. (2010) build on this research by examining what individual factors may prevent an individual from having a small-world, and instead lead to long or ineffective searches for knowledge. Using data from a professional services firm, they theorize and find that individuals on the periphery of the organization's knowledge network— due to little experience, minority gender status, or poor connectedness—take significantly longer to reach an expert with a question than their more central counterparts do. The challenge, in part, is that these individuals not only do not know who knows what in the organization (Wegner 1987), but also they pursue ineffective search strategies as they turn to others, like themselves, who also do not know where important knowledge resides.

A KR offers a potential solution to the lack of an organizational knowledge network. Since individuals may not know who has the requisite knowledge or, alternatively, are uncomfortable reaching outside of their own peripheral networks, they can instead use an electronic KR. This view highlights that *access* is the ability to acquire knowledge because of an open channel to it. Peripheral players have an open channel to the KR because it is universally available and does not require interpersonal interaction for use. Central players similarly have an open channel to the KR as a potential source of knowledge, but unlike peripheral players, they also have additional channels for potential knowledge flow because of ties to colleagues. Based on this conception of access, one could predict that peripheral players may be more likely than central players to use the KR: they may use the KR because it provides access where other access is unavailable, and central players may neglect the KR because of their abundant access to other knowledge sources.

However, a second perspective suggests a key challenge that might limit peripheral players. This perspective suggests that real access depends on understanding. That is, someone can access a calculus book by opening its pages, but the content might be inaccessible unless she understands math principles. As another

analogy, someone might have access to a country with an open border, but the culture and accommodations might be inaccessible unless she understands the language. Both central and peripheral players enjoy the "open border" of a KR because of its networked interface and universal availability. However, central players have more than a terminal and a password—they are also embedded in locations and networks that help them understand the language of the organization and the KR (see, for example Boh 2008, Demian and Fruchter 2006, Markus 2001).

We propose that central players will be motivated to use the KR because they expect to be able to derive value from it due to their embeddedness in enabling social conditions (Bock et al. 2008, Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). In contrast, peripheral players are likely left to find and understand relevant knowledge in the KR on their own. They may be intimidated by the metaphorical language barrier and less likely to get help accessing relevant knowledge. The KR provides access in the sense that peripheral players are able to make use of the KR whenever they want; however, this shallow access does not guarantee that they identify or understand the correct knowledge. For that kind of access, we suggest that social conditions that provide access to other sources of knowledge are needed.

We develop hypotheses for five conditions known to put people on the periphery of organizational knowledge networks—inexperience, remote location, limited familiarity with teammates, minority gender status, and front-line status—and argue that people working under each of these conditions will use a KR less than their more centrally positioned counterparts.

3.1. Individual Experience and Knowledge Retrieval

Despite this potentially real need to access knowledge, individuals' limited experience may actually hinder knowledge retrieval for newer employees. First, they have less experience of their own on which to draw (Reagans et al. 2005). Their lack of personal experience may make much of the knowledge in the KR inaccessible. Knowledge retrieval is most effective when prompted by a well-developed question about how to do something specific (Markus 2001). Inexperienced individuals may be struggling with questions like, "What does this mean?" or "How does this relate to that?" and not know how to pose a specific question in the technical language of the organization (Gray and Durcikova 2005). Second, the less-experienced workers tend to be on the periphery of organizational knowledge networks and so have less access to knowledgeable colleagues (Singh et al. 2010). In other words, their position on the periphery of knowledge sharing networks means inexperienced individuals may not have help in searching for or applying what they find. Third, the colleagues to whom the inexperienced workers

have access to are likely to be inexperienced as well (Reagans 2011, Singh et al. 2010), have equally little KR knowledge, and be on the periphery of the knowledge network. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 1. *More experienced individuals will use the knowledge repository more than less experienced individuals.*

3.2. Location and Knowledge Retrieval

Individuals working in remote organizational locations also tend to be on the periphery of knowledge sharing networks. They interact with only a few colleagues face to face and confront significant challenges communicating and coordinating with their distant colleagues (Gibson and Gibbs 2006, Hinds and Bailey 2003, Martins et al. 2004). Isolated team members therefore need rich modes of communication to support performance and collaboration with the rest of their team (Majchrzak et al. 2005b, Malhotra et al. 2001). In other words, this disadvantaged locational position increases the need for access to nonlocal knowledge sources for individuals working in remote sites.

Despite acknowledging this real need for knowledge retrieval, we argue that being located in the central rather than peripheral organizational offices is more conducive to knowledge retrieval for the following reasons. First, as with experienced individuals, individuals in the central offices have larger knowledge-sharing networks and thus more social support to enable use. They can regularly interact with many colleagues because the central offices are usually much larger than remote offices, where only a few colocated colleagues may be available (O'Leary and Mortensen 2010). Face-to-face interaction with a variety of colleagues enables easier discussions about new ways to solve or think about problems (Cramton 2001), in addition to helping articulate specific questions, structure queries, and apply retrieved knowledge. Second, individuals in central offices are supported in understanding the size and scope of the organization and how they relate to the knowledge stored in the KR. For example, central players typically work in a large, multispace office. They pass by other project offices on their way to their own office space, thereby tacitly experiencing the scope of their organization (see, for example, Mortensen and Neeley 2012). They will also have more nonproject interactions in hallways and social spaces (Festinger et al. 1963, Kiesler and Cummings 2002). This may give them a uniquely comprehensive perspective on the expertise and the nature of the work in the firm (such as clients, industries, and technologies served), which may help them understand what is done and what is known in the organization (Orlikowski 2002). In a central position, there is little need to create knowledge or solutions from scratch. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 2. *Individuals located in the central organizational offices will use the KF more than individuals located in peripheral offices.*

3.3. Team Familiarity and Knowledge Retrieval

A lack of social capital accumulated with team members can position individuals at the periphery of their team knowledge-sharing network and increase their need for knowledge access, but team members with more social capital are likely to be better supported in their knowledge retrieval. Individuals who are familiar with their teammates are more likely to trust them and ask for their help (Siemsen et al. 2009). They will also have access to many different sources of knowledge within the team (Tucker 2007), which makes it easier to use the KR, for example, to identify a closely related strategy that might not look related to someone with limited knowledge.

We also consider the influence of team-level familiarity on team members. This question considers how the overall level of social capital in the team influences the knowledge retrieval of a focal team member. We argue that overall team familiarity will support more knowledge retrieval by any focal team member. Team familiarity supports trust, information sharing, and effective coordination (Huckman and Staats 2011, Pisano et al. 2001). Familiar teams are more likely to have a shared understanding of task requirements (Balkundi and Harrison 2006, Staats 2012). Familiar teams are also more likely to know who knows what within the team and use this knowledge to coordinate their activities (Gino et al. 2010, Lewis et al. 2005). Individuals on familiar teams will thus be better supported in knowledge retrieval. Familiar teams will help their team members derive value from the KR and will provide them with access to additional knowledge because of strong within-team networks, which in turn will support knowledge retrieval. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 3. *Individuals on teams with greater familiarity will use the KR more than those on teams with a lack of familiarity.*

3.4. Minority Gender Status and Knowledge Retrieval

The minority gender status of a worker within the team (in this case, female) may affect her using KR. First, being of the minority gender is likely to move the individual to the periphery of a company's knowledge network (e.g., Brass 1985, Ibarra 1997). In particular, the minority gender is not only pushed to the less connected position in the workflow network (Podolny and Baron 1997), but also often excluded from the social connections with the majority gender outside work, where people generally strengthen their bonds and communication (Kanter 1993). For example, as noted by Singh et al. (2010), men may skip inviting women to happy hours after work because women tend to choose to directly go home for family reasons. Consequently, the minority gender may be unknowledgeable about how to use the KR or may feel hesitant to consult other team members about the knowledge retrieval. Furthermore, being the minority gender may create homophily in terms of knowledge search strategy (Ibarra 1997). Since the periphery position of the minority gender makes these workers less able to seek help with knowledge retrieval from the majority gender, they may turn to other minority gender workers, who have equally little knowledge about the KR. Thus, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 4. *Male employees will use the KR more than female employees.*

3.5. Front-Line Status and Knowledge Retrieval

The final dimension that we consider is that of the role within the team. Many teams, including the software development project teams that we analyzed, have a hierarchical structure whereby certain members (e.g., managers) are given rights and powers over the other team members. In general, given their greater status and knowledge, managers may be better positioned within a firm's knowledge network. For example, individuals must learn the responsibilities and tasks within their roles; experience within each role may help improve team performance (Huckman et al. 2009). Given the progression from team member to manager, managers have served in both roles. Their advantageous knowledge network positions may help them better find knowledge, as their role may enable them to meet clients or experts within the organization. Moreover, managers' increased status, arising from their role, may make it easier for them to get a response from those from whom they request knowledge.

Admittedly, team members are likely to have more use for a KR, as it may help them close the knowledge gap that exists, compared to a manager. However, as with the other dimensions, the better-positioned individual may actually use the repository more than the worse positioned individual. The greater awareness and understanding that a manager's role creates may also lead the manager to better understand what knowledge is available within a repository and to search more effectively to find it. Therefore, we hypothesize the following:

Hypothesis 5. *Managers will use the KR more than individuals with front-line status* (*in this case, project engineers*).

4. Data

We received data from Wipro on all software development projects that occurred in a two-year period. The archival data captured individual knowledge retrieval and team project descriptors. Note that the knowledge retrieval data recorded how many unique downloads each individual completed on a given day during the two-year research period. Wipro did not document an

Table 1. Summary Statistics and Correlation Table of Variables in the Individual Knowledge Retrieval Models ($n = 13{,}470$)

Variable	Mean	σ	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. *Individual Knowledge Retrieval*	0.47	0.88													
2. *Individual Experience*	1.82	2.36	**0.12**												
3. *Individual Located in India*	0.88	0.33	**0.06**	−0.18											
4. *Team Familiarity*	0.29	0.70	**0.05**	**0.11**	−0.03										
5. *Male*	0.70	0.46	**0.03**	**0.11**	−0.12	0.00									
6. *Manager*	0.16	0.37	**0.10**	**0.37**	−0.13	0.02	**0.13**								
7. *Team Experience*	2.36	1.12	0.00	**0.14**	−0.05	**0.13**	0.01	**0.05**							
8. *% of Team Located in India*	0.86	0.14	**0.02**	−0.04	**0.28**	−0.05	0.00	−0.04	−0.05						
9. *Male % on Team*	0.75	0.13	−0.02	0.00	−0.03	−0.06	**0.15**	0.04	**0.12**	−0.05					
10. *Manager % on Team*	0.16	0.10	**0.05**	**0.10**	−0.05	0.07	0.04	**0.27**	**0.20**	−0.15	**0.15**				
11. *Project Scale*	3.32	1.98	**0.06**	−0.03	0.01	−0.08	−0.01	0.01	−0.14	−0.01	−0.02	0.02			
12. *Estimated Effort*	9.38	1.17	**0.11**	−0.05	−0.03	−0.17	0.00	0.00	−0.14	−0.14	0.04	−0.02	**0.32**		
13. *Estimated Duration*	5.63	0.62	**0.09**	−0.04	0.00	−0.18	0.00	0.02	−0.20	−0.04	0.10	0.07	**0.26**	**0.65**	
14. *Contract Type*	0.41	0.49	−0.01	**0.04**	−0.01	−0.07	0.02	0.00	**0.13**	0.04	0.10	0.02	−0.02	0.03	−0.02

Note. Bold denotes significance of less than 5%.

identifier for the knowledge artifact viewed, so the specific content viewed is unknown. We matched the above data with demographic data on the 10,703 individuals who worked on software development team projects. We then dropped 130 projects, each of which served only one client because we controlled for the fixed effects of the client being served in our empirical models. Controlling for the idiosyncratic and time-invariant aspects of a client (e.g., client involvement in the project) was important because that could affect knowledge retrieval. Our final data set included information on the 481 software development projects that were started and completed during the study period, meaning we had comprehensive knowledge retrieval data for the entirety of each project's lifetime.

4.1. Dependent Variable

Table 1 provides summary statistics for the variables used in this paper.

4.1.1. *Individual Knowledge Retrieval.* The outcome variable *Individual Knowledge Retrieval* is calculated as $\log(\sum_1^n unique_n)$, where $unique_n$ equals the total number of unique knowledge artifacts accessed (i.e., downloaded) during a day and n denotes each day during the duration of the project. As a robustness check, we define a variable *Anyuse*, which is equal to 1 if an individual ever uses the knowledge repository and is 0 otherwise.

4.2. Independent Variables

4.2.1. *Individual Experience.* Consistent with prior literature examining human capital (Huckman and Pisano 2006), we measure experience using an individual's firm-specific experience. We construct a variable, *Individual Experience*, to capture the number of years an individual worked at Wipro prior to the start of the project. Hypothesis 1 predicts that more experienced individuals will be more likely to use the KR, so the coefficient on *Individual Experience* should be positive.

4.2.2. *Individual Located in India.* Wipro is an Indian organization, with its headquarters in India and the majority of its workers there as well. Therefore, we define an individual who is located in an Indian office as more central in the geographic network of the firm and accordingly create a variable, *Individual Located in India*, which is equal to 1 if an individual is located in an Indian facility, and is 0 otherwise. Hypothesis 2 predicts that centrally located individuals will be more likely to use the KR, so the coefficient on *Individual Located in India* should be positive.

4.2.3. *Team Familiarity.* Project team members typically worked on one project at any given time and each team member was reassigned to new projects when the original project was completed. Team members also had different lengths of firm tenure. These dynamics created variability in the prior interactions among team members. To calculate *Team Familiarity*, we sum the number of projects that each unique dyad on the team completed together during the previous three years. We then divide the sum by the total unique dyads within the team to generate our variable (Reagans et al. 2005). Using a window of three years accounts for the potential decay of knowledge over time (e.g., Argote et al. 1990). The average project lasted for about seven months, so a three-year window matches the empirical context and allows us to include multiple cycles of projects.

An important question is whether to create a team-wide measure of the variable or to capture team familiarity between an individual and all other team members (i.e., the number of prior ties an individual has on the team). This individual-level measure is highly correlated with the team-level measure (correlation = 0.81), which may cause multicollinearity. In addition, prior work has relied on the team-level measure (Huckman et al. 2009, Reagans et al. 2005). Hence, we choose the team-level measure to represent team

familiarity. Hypothesis 3 predicts that familiarity with teammates will lead to an increased use of the KR, so the coefficient on *Team Familiarity* should be positive.

4.2.4. Gender. Since 26% of the individuals in our data are female, we define the minority gender in our setting as female. Accordingly, we construct an indicator, *Male*, which equals 1 if the individual is male and 0 otherwise. Hypothesis 4 predicts that individuals of the majority gender will use the KR more than individuals of the minority gender, so the coefficient on *Male* should be positive.

4.2.5. Hierarchical Role. Individuals are classified into one of three roles within a project team. Project managers are responsible for leading the project. Depending on the project size, they may also do some technical work. Middle managers are leaders who assume a player/coach role. They lead subteams within the project, coach team members, and write code. Finally, project engineers are responsible for writing code and conducting the technical work of the project. We create an indicator, *Manager*, which equals 1 if the individual is a project manager or a middle manager and 0 if she is an engineer. Hypothesis 5 predicts that managers will use the KR more than front-line individuals, so the coefficient on *Manager* should be positive.

4.3. Control Variables
We control for a number of other variables that may affect individual knowledge use.

4.3.1. Team Experience. We assess *Team Experience* by averaging the individual experience variable across all members on the team.

4.3.2. % of Team Located in India. As previously discussed, the software development teams that we study either work "offshore" at the company's facilities in India or "onsite" at client locations. We calculate the number of hours the team completed at the Indian facilities and divide this value by the total number of hours the team worked. Repeating the analyses with a variable calculated using the number of team members in each location, instead of the hours, we obtain a pattern of results.

4.3.3. Male % on Team. To control for the gender dynamics on the team, we calculate the number of hours completed on the team by males and then divide that value by the total number of hours worked by the team. Repeating the analyses with a variable calculated using the number of male team members, instead of the hours, produces similar results.

4.3.4. Manager % on Team. To control for team effects from hierarchical role differences, we calculate the number of hours managers on the team completed and then divide that value by the total number of hours worked by the team. Repeating the analyses with a variable calculated using the number of managers, instead of the hours, produces similar results.

4.3.5. Project Scale. We control for the scale of the project because more complex projects may have had greater knowledge needs and resulted in more use of a KR. We capture the project scale using the kilolines of new source code (MacCormack et al. 2001). Prior work showed that software can exhibit scale effects (Banker and Kemerer 1989), so we log-transform the variable in our models.

4.3.6. Estimated Effort and Duration. Projects that involved more effort in terms of hours or workdays might have been more difficult and may have required greater use of the KR. To control for both of these potential effects, we include the logarithm of the project's estimated total person-hours and the logarithm of the project's estimated total days.

4.3.7. Contract Type. Wipro used either a fixed-price contract structure or a time-and-materials contract structure for its development projects. In the former, the payment was agreed prior to the start of the project; in the latter, Wipro received a prespecified rate for the hours that it worked on the project. Given the role of incentives in individual and team performance, we control for contract type. We include an indicator variable in our models that is set to one if the project is fixed-price and is zero for time-and-materials.

4.3.8. Software Languages: Number and Type. Different software languages may have different knowledge demands, leading to different patterns of knowledge retrieval. Similarly, projects with multiple software languages (53% of projects) may have greater knowledge demands and lead to more knowledge retrieval. We control for the former by including indicator variables for the different languages used (C, C++, Java, query, markup, and BASIC). We adjust for the latter with an indicator variable equal to 1 if a project has more than one software language and 0 otherwise.

4.3.9. Technologies. Projects that used multiple classes of technologies (e.g., client server, e-commerce) could lead to more knowledge retrieval. Thus, we create an indicator variable that equals 1 if a project has more than one technology (10% of projects) and 0 otherwise (90% of projects).

4.4. Analysis Strategy
Since we were unable to conduct a field experiment to study our question of interest, we turn to archival data analysis. In such analysis, an important concern is whether selection effects might exist that drive the subsequent results. For example, if familiar individuals were placed on teams that had a higher need for knowledge retrieval, then we might find the hypothesized effects, but for the wrong reason (team selection, rather than knowledge use challenges). Similar problems could exist if any of our other variables exhibited

selection effects. Firm management did not see selection effects as a concern for two reasons. First, factors such as familiarity were not used to staff team members, and project managers did not have the ability to select team members. Second, although different types of projects might have different knowledge needs, we focus on one type (i.e., development), which provides us with a "clean" setting to examine the individual-related effect on knowledge retrieval. We further control for important factors of the project, such as project complexity, estimated effort, software language used, and technology, to mitigate this selection bias concern, though our design does not permit us to rule it out completely.

Our study contains data at three levels: individual, team project, and client account. That is, individuals are nested in projects (teams), and projects are nested in client accounts. To be more precise, individuals are cross-classified because the same individuals can be sequentially staffed within different teams. Consequently, the individuals within the same team and the same teams working for the same client are likely to have similar knowledge retrieval needs. In addition, our hypothesized independent variables may have similar effects on the knowledge retrieval for the members within the same team, for the same client account. Ignoring these within cluster correlations at different levels in traditional estimation procedures, such as ordinary least squares, may cause wrong standard errors and inconsistent estimates (Cameron and Trivedi 2005).

To address this issue, we adopt a hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) approach in our analysis. The HLM technique allows correlations between the residuals in the same cluster (either teams or client accounts). In addition, it works for the unbalanced data structure in our setting in that each cluster has a different number of observations. For these reasons, HLM is often used in social sciences to analyze data with a natural hierarchical structure (Raudenbush and Bryk 2002). In particular, it was applied in recent studies on teams and management KM, to which our study contributes Kang et al. (2012), Ko and Dennis (2011).

We try to use the strengths of our unique data set on individual knowledge retrieval and sequentially construct multilevel models to ensure the consistency of our hypothesis testing related to individual use within project teams. Similar to other studies using HLM (DeHoratius and Raman 2008), we first estimate a null model (Model 1), which includes only random intercepts at the client account level (Level 3) and project level (Level 2). We then introduce the hypothesized independent variables into the model (i.e., *Individual Experience, Individual Located in India, Team Familiarity, Male, Manager*). Finally, we add the control variables (defined in Section 4.3), and that completes our full model (Model 2).

The null model of individual knowledge retrieval for observation i, which belongs to project j and client account k is defined as follows:

$$Individual\ Knowledge\ Retrieval_{ijk} = \alpha_0 + \beta_{00j} + \chi_{00k}$$
$$+ \varepsilon_{ijk}, \qquad (1)$$

where $\beta_{00j} \sim N(0, \sigma_j)$ represents the random main effect of project/team, and $\chi_{00k} \sim N(0, \sigma_k)$ is the random main effect of client account.

Our full model is specified as follows:

$$Individual\ Knowledge\ Retrieval_{ijk}$$
$$= \alpha_0 + \beta_{00j} + \chi_{00k} + \lambda_1 Individual\ Experience_{ijk}$$
$$+ \lambda_2 Individual\ Located\ in\ India_{ijk} + \lambda_3 Team\ Familiarity_{ijk}$$
$$+ \lambda_4 Male_{ijk} + \lambda_5 Manager_{ijk} + \delta_1 Team\ Experience_j$$
$$+ \delta_2\ \%\ of\ Team\ Located\ in\ India_j + \delta_3 Male\ \%\ on\ Team_j$$
$$+ \delta_4 Manager\ \%\ on\ Team_j + \delta_5 Project\ Scale_j$$
$$+ \delta_6 Estimated\ Effort_j + \delta_7 Estimated\ Duration_j$$
$$+ \delta_8 Contract\ Type_j + \delta_9 Software\ Language_j$$
$$+ \delta_{10} Technologies_j + \varepsilon_{ijk}, \qquad (2)$$

where $\lambda_1 - \lambda_5$ are random individual-level coefficients, varying across different projects (except for λ_3, which varies across client accounts because it is a team-level measure). We specify that these coefficients are random instead of fixed because the likelihood ratio tests reject the null hypothesis that the slope coefficients are zero, and because the random slopes allow individual heterogeneity. In addition, we assume $\delta_1 - \delta_{10}$ to be fixed project-level coefficients of the control variables for computation reasons because too many random coefficients rapidly increase the number of parameters to estimate (Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal 2008).

All the models are estimated using full maximum likelihood technique (Stata command: xtmixed). In addition, we estimate crossed random effects to allow individuals to be nested within both project and client account levels because an individual may be sequentially staffed in different projects/teams.

5. Results

Table 2 provides a summary of our results. Column 1 presents the null model, where we find that the individual level (Level 1) contributes to 80% of the total variance in knowledge retrieval; the project level (Level 2) contributes 16%, and the client account level (Level 3) 4%. The significant intraclass correlation (80%) at the individual level makes it interesting to examine the effect of individuals' network positions on knowledge retrieval, which we hypothesize. Column 2 shows the hierarchical model with just the independent variables, and Column 3 adds the control variables to provide a more complete test of our

Table 2. Summary Results of the Regression of Individual Knowledge Retrieval ($n = 13,470$)

	Dependent variable *Individual Knowledge Retrieval*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Individual Experience		0.0407***	0.0421***
		(0.0048)	(0.0048)
Individual Located in India		0.2216***	0.2279***
		(0.0258)	(0.0261)
Team Familiarity		0.2024**	0.2274***
		(0.0667)	(0.0684)
Male		0.0087	0.0146
		(0.0174)	(0.0177)
Manager		0.1599***	0.1614***
		(0.0274)	(0.0275)
Team Experience			−0.0136
			(0.0152)
% of Team Located in India			−0.0268
			(0.1210)
Male % on Team			−0.2017+
			(0.1152)
Manager % on Team			0.1051
			(0.1601)
Project Scale			0.0174+
			(0.0094)
Estimated Effort			0.0537*
			(0.0216)
Estimated Duration			0.0444
			(0.0365)
Contract Type			0.0012
			(0.0369)
Software Languages			−0.0289
			(0.0388)
C			0.0392
			(0.0441)
Cplus			0.0930*
			(0.0469)
Query			0.0056
			(0.0513)
Basic			0.0534
			(0.0664)
Technologies			−0.1312*
			(0.0614)
Constant	0.4949***	0.1462***	−0.4789*
	(0.0230)	(0.0347)	(0.2403)
Observations	13,470	13,470	13,470
Prob > Chi-sq	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

Note. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.

+, *, **, and *** denote significance at the 10%, 5%, 1%, and 0.1% levels, respectively.

hypotheses. We interpret the coefficients from Column 3 because the results of the independent variables are consistent across the models.

Hypothesis 1 predicts that individual experience would be positively associated with knowledge retrieval, and we find support for this hypothesis: the coefficient on individual experience is positive and statistically significant (0.0421). A one standard deviation increase in individual experience (2.36) is related to an approximate 10% increase from the average amount of knowledge retrieval. At the mean level of knowledge retrieval (1.82), that would correspond to an individual using the KR approximately 0.2 more times per project, controlling for everything else.

In support of Hypothesis 2, which predicts that individuals located in India—Wipro's central location—would use the knowledge repository more, we find a statistically significant and positive coefficient of the individual's location. An individual based in India would use the KR 22.79% more than an individual not based in India, which translates to about 0.4 times more than the current mean KR usage.

Turning to Hypothesis 3—team familiarity—we find that individuals on familiar teams are more likely to use the KR system than those on less familiar teams because the coefficient is significant and positive (0.2274). Interpreting this coefficient, we estimate that a one standard deviation increase in team familiarity (0.7) is related to a 15.9% increase in individual knowledge retrieval. At the mean level of knowledge retrieval on a project, that would correspond to an individual using the KR close to 0.3 times more per project.

Next, Hypothesis 4 suggests that members of the majority gender, males in this case, would be more likely to use the KR. The coefficient on *Male* turns out to be statistically indistinguishable from zero, so our hypothesis is unsupported.

Finally, supporting Hypothesis 5, which posits that managers will use KR more than front-line team members, we find that the coefficient of *Manager* is significant and positive (0.1614). In other words, on average, managers would use the KR 16.1% more frequently than front-line team members. This is close to 0.3 times the mean level of knowledge retrieval per project.

Looking briefly at our other control variables, we see that the other team-level measures turn out to be statistically insignificantly related to knowledge retrieval except the following: *Male % on Team, Project Scale, Estimated Effort, Cplus,* and *Technologies.* For *Male % on Team,* although the result is partially statistically significant at 0.1 level, it is consistent with the idea that the minority gender (females) may use the KR more when surrounded by more of their own group members, as this could provide them with the social support necessary to use the system (Gibson and Vermeulen 2003). For *Project Scale, Estimated Effort, CPlus,* and *Technology,* the significant results provide evidence that supports the theory that larger, more demanding and complex projects create conditions for more knowledge retrieval, which is within our expectation.

6. Robustness Checks

A key question in an empirical paper is whether different modeling choices might have generated qualitatively different results. Therefore, we repeat our

Table 3. Summary Results of Robustness Tests

	Model: Negative binomial	Model: Fixed effects regression	Model: Logistic regression	Personal team familiarity	Herfindahl within teams	Herfindahls with teams excluding average effect
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Individual Experience	0.0788***	0.0399***	0.1215***	0.0406***	0.0422***	0.0421***
	(0.0054)	(0.0034)	(0.0091)	(0.0035)	(0.0047)	(0.0047)
Individual Located in India	0.5096***	0.2252***	0.6711***	0.2230***	0.2244***	0.2195***
	(0.0521)	(0.0238)	(0.0682)	(0.0244)	(0.0255)	(0.0251)
Team Familiarity	0.0871***	0.0406**	0.1476***	0.0753***	0.2614***	0.2674***
	(0.0198)	(0.0149)	(0.0383)	(0.0187)	(0.0655)	(0.0663)
Male	−0.0376	0.0043	−0.0592	−0.0042	0.0115	0.0094
	(0.0334)	(0.0167)	(0.0453)	(0.0173)	(0.0177)	(0.0174)
Manager	0.3141***	0.1656***	0.4039***	0.1646***	0.1607***	0.1604***
	(0.0395)	(0.0219)	(0.0580)	(0.0228)	(0.0275)	(0.0275)
Personal Team Familiarity				0.0036		
				(0.0169)		
Herfidhal—Experience					0.8296***	0.7621***
					(0.1645)	(0.1622)
Herfindahl—Location					−0.5600***	−0.5700***
					(0.0730)	(0.0720)
Herfindahl—Team Familiarity					0.2714*	0.2880*
					(0.1288)	(0.1287)
Herfindahl—Gender					0.2285	0.0291
					(0.1769)	(0.1484)
Herfindahl—Project Role					−0.3044	−0.0115
					(0.4097)	(0.1144)
Other project-level controls	Included	Included	Included	Included	Included	Excluded
Constant	−3.9152***	−0.6405***		−1.0015***	−0.1365	−0.6323*
	(0.2738)	(0.1705)		(0.1079)	(0.4760)	(0.2466)
Observations	13,413	13,470	13,409	13,470	13,470	13,470

Note. Standard errors are shown in parentheses.
   *, **, and *** denote significance at the 5%, 1%, and 0.1% levels, respectively.

main model using a count outcome variable, a non-hierarchical model, and a dichotomous outcome variable in Table 3. Accordingly, Columns 1–3 provide our robustness checks with the negative binomial, linear regression with client account fixed effects, and logistic regression models, respectively. Examining the coefficients, we find that each of our supported hypotheses (Hypothesis 1–3, and 5) continues to be supported. The coefficients in Columns 1–3 are statistically and organizationally significant in each case and congruent with the results in Table 2.

An additional question arises with respect to our decision to capture familiarity as a team-level variable, rather than an individual-specific one. To address this concern, we repeat our main model and add a variable corresponding to *Individual Team Familiarity*. This variable is constructed by counting the number of prior projects between the focal individual and all others on the team and then dividing it by the number of team members minus one. Note that the individual team familiarity variable is highly correlated with our team familiarity variable (0.82). Whether we include

the individual variable with the team one (shown in Table 3, Column 4) or only the individual variable (not shown), we find that *Individual Team Familiarity* turns out to show a statistically insignificant relationship with knowledge retrieval. Including it in the model does not meaningfully change the effect of team familiarity on knowledge retrieval, suggesting that our main results are robust.

Finally, for parsimony, we have used the mean values of the team variables to control for team-level effects. An alternative approach would be to include a dispersion measure, such as the Herfindahl index, which captures the dispersion of the underlying measure across the team. For example, a higher value of the Herfindahl index of team experience indicates that the experience within the team is concentrated within a smaller number of team members, while a lower value means that experience is more diffuse within the team. We introduce a Herfindahl measure for experience, team familiarity, location, gender, and role, respectively. In Table 3, Column 5, we include the new measures to the original main model, and in Column 6, we keep the

Herfindahl measures and remove the team-level mean measures (except for team familiarity). In both cases, our key hypotheses continue to be supported.

7. Discussion and Conclusion

Scaling service operations is a challenge. In particular, developing the necessary skills within a workforce is difficult, and even more challenging for firms in developing markets. Hiring ready-trained individuals is often not an option. Instead, if the firm is to grow, it must create operational processes that support workforce development. One such approach is to use a KR to address the gaps that may exist. However, we hypothesize that instead of the KR being used more by those individuals who are less central in the firm's knowledge network, just the opposite will be the case. Individuals who are more central in the knowledge network—due to experience, location, team familiarity, or role—have both awareness and the ability to access knowledge in a KR and therefore will use it more.

Our empirical results support our theory. The key finding of this study is that use of a KR in a firm facing a scaling challenge is dominated by people who are operating at the center of organizational knowledge networks. We know from prior research that knowledge retrieval is also associated with objective team performance (Haas and Hansen 2007). This presents a conundrum. Core players are expected to perform better to begin with because of their enabling work conditions (Cramton 2001, Gardner et al. 2012, Huckman et al. 2009). Our paper shows these conditions also support them in accessing additional knowledge resources. Thus, instead of the KR equalizing knowledge access across organizational members, the knowledge-embedded individuals became more embedded through using a KR. These results present crucial implications for two broad domains: team effectiveness and KM.

Our study provides a critical perspective on team effectiveness for today's global firms, which increasingly deploy teams with fluid and distributed membership. For these teams to be effective, their leaders and managers must learn how to support coordination of work between unfamiliar and virtual teammates. KRs offer a potential plug-and-play technology solution by making knowledge available even to people with limited interpersonal knowledge access. Unfortunately, the KR does not overcome the taxing conditions faced by today's work teams to reach those at the organization's periphery. Inexperienced, remote, or front-line individuals, as well as those on unfamiliar teams, do not draw on the organizational resources provided in the KR. Taken alone, this technology solution fails to resolve the challenges facing globally distributed teams. Prior theory shows that these factors may be limits in the search of organizational knowledge (Singh

et al. 2010) due to limited networks. The implication for KM systems is that since a KR is an IT system, this should not be a problem (Alavi and Leidner 2001). However, our results show that this is unequivocally not the case.

Our setting and analyses also provide a novel perspective on virtual teams. Much of the research on virtual teams has focused on supporting virtual team effectiveness (e.g., by establishing norms or developing trust) (Gibson and Cohen 2003, Martins et al. 2004) but has not explored the relationship between virtual teams and their deploying organization. Even research on technology use in virtual teams has tended to focus on how information technology connects team members to *each other* (Hollingshead 1996, Majchrzak et al. 2005a), and less on how technology connects virtual team members to their organization as a whole. Workers spread across the globe are often working on similar projects for similar clients, and could thus benefit greatly from each other's expertise. Therefore, keeping virtual workers connected to what the organization knows may provide strategic value. However, we show that dispersed individuals are less likely than their centrally located counterparts to make use of the organization's knowledge resources. Not only do they experience challenges accessing their teammates' knowledge, they also face challenges accessing the organization's electronic stores of knowledge. Future research could investigate what knowledge resources virtual teams draw on in their work and under what conditions they do so.

7.1. Limitations

Our findings have several important limitations. Although our data are archival and detailed, they did not allow us to see exactly which components individuals downloaded. This information could greatly enrich our understanding of the kinds of KR artifacts that are used, under what conditions, and how this influences performance. We argue that this limitation is not likely to bias our results in a systematic way (i.e., our hypotheses focus on amount of use rather than content of use), but it does prevent broader claims and understanding. In addition, our analysis is of one KR in one organization during a time when no active incentive programs were in place. There is considerable variation in how KM initiatives are structured (Boh 2008, Davenport et al. 1998), so our results may not apply to all organizations with a KR. This setting allowed us to establish a baseline for the social conditions associated with knowledge retrieval. Moreover, Wipro is similar to many organizations in emerging markets that grow rapidly and are forced to scale their personnel to deliver a service. Therefore, we would expect to see similar results at other emerging market firms. In addition, the challenges that individuals on the periphery

face are likely significant in firms based in developed markets; however, future research should explore this, in addition to different policies to manage KR.

An additional limitation comes from the archival nature of our study. Our empirical analysis relies on controlling for the factors in the data observable to both the researchers and the employees and on qualitative discussions with firm personnel to indicate that unobservable factors are not biasing our results. Although this seems to be the case, we cannot guarantee it to be so. In other words, our study does not provide a precise mechanism for causal inference. For example, is it possible that experienced team members have seen their knowledge depreciate, such that they have greater knowledge demands and are therefore more likely to use the KR system to fill those needs, compared to their inexperienced counterparts? As explained earlier, this is unlikely to be the case, given the type of work conducted and the slow rate at which technology is changing. Nevertheless, future research should look to deploy causal methods, such as a field experiment to examine these questions in more detail.

7.2. Managerial Implications
Our findings offer both good news and a cautionary note for managers. AMR Research estimated that in 2007, the global market for knowledge repository and collaboration technologies was approximately $73 billion (Murphy and Hackbush 2007). Prior research showed that *actual* use of a KR is in fact associated with objective team performance, which is optimistic news for those who have invested in these systems (Devaraj and Kohli 2003, Haas and Hansen 2007). However, our results also sound a cautionary note for managers. Despite the promise that KRs offer to global firms in general and developing market firms in particular, we find that KRs enrich the knowledge access of central players in the organization; they are less effective at ensuring much-needed access for those on the periphery. In other words, the KR provides a marginal performance gain for teams that would already be expected to perform well. Further work is needed to identify how managers can encourage productive knowledge retrieval—or offer other kinds of support—to individuals working in remote locations, who have limited organizational tenure, or who are in fluid teams where members do not know each other well. Just as research in productivity with information technology suggests that there is complementarity (e.g., Aral et al. 2012)—managers must make changes to fully benefit from the tools at hand—the same is likely the case for turning KRs into highly productive tools.

7.3. Conclusion
Scaling a service operation requires building and spreading knowledge throughout the firm. This challenge grows even more difficult when individuals are on the periphery of organizational knowledge sharing networks, due to inexperience, location, lack of social capital, or their front-line status. Although a KR is a potential tool to address such gaps, we show instead a pattern of use for individuals and teams working in more supportive conditions. Our results suggest that scaling service operations may depend critically on getting the conditions right, thus enabling people to support each other, to make use of available resources, and to perform more effectively.

References
Alavi M, Leidner DE (2001) Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quart.* 25(1):107–136.

Aral S, Brynjolfsson E, Wu L (2012) Three-way complementarities: Performance pay, human resource analytics, and information technology. *Management Sci.* 58(5):913–931.

Argote L, Beckman SL, Epple D (1990) The persistence and transfer of learning in industrial settings. *Management Sci.* 36(2):140–154.

Arora A, Asundi J (1999) Quality certification and the economics of contract software development: A study of the Indian software industry. NBER Working paper 7260, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Arora A, Arunachalam VS, Asundi J, Fernandes R (2001) The Indian software services industry. *Res. Policy* 30(8):1267–1287.

Athreye SS (2005a) The Indian software industry. Arora A, Gambardella A, eds. *From Underdogs to Tigers: The Rise and Growth of the Software Industry in Brazil, China, India, Ireland, and Israel* (Oxford University Press, London), 7–40.

Athreye SS (2005b) The Indian software industry and its evolving service capability. *Indust. Corporate Change* 14(3):393–418.

Balkundi P, Harrison DA (2006) Ties, leaders, and time in teams: Strong inference about network structure's effects on team viability and performance. *Acad. Management J.* 49(1):49–68.

Banker RD, Kemerer CF (1989) Scale economies in new software development. *IEEE Trans. Software Engrg.* 15(10):1199–1206.

Bartel A, Ichniowski C, Shaw K (2007) How does information technology affect productivity? Plant-level comparisons of product innovation, process improvement, and worker skills. *Quart. J. Econom.* 122(4):1721–1758.

Bock GW, Sabherwal R, Qian ZJ (2008) The effect of social context on the success of knowledge repository systems. *IEEE Trans. Engrg. Management* 55(4):536–551.

Boehm B (1981) *Software Engineering Economics* (Prentice Hall, New York).

Boh WF (2008) Reuse of knowledge assets from repositories: A mixed methods study. *Inform. Management* 45(6):365–375.

Brass DJ (1985) Men's and women's networks: A study of interaction patterns and influence in an organization. *Acad. Management J.* 28(2):327–343.

Brynjolfsson E, Hitt LM (1996) Paradox lost? Firm-level evidence on the returns to information systems spending. *Management Sci.* 42(4):541–558.

Cameron AC, Trivedi PK (2005) *Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).

Cramton CD (2001) The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. *Organ. Sci.* 12(3):346–371.

Cummings JN, Espinosa JA, Pickering CK (2009) Crossing spatial and temporal boundaries in globally distributed projects: A relational model of coordination delay. *Inform. Systems Res.* 20(3):420–439.

Davenport TH, Prusak L (1998) *Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know* (Harvard Business School Press, Boston).

Davenport TH, De Long DW, Beers MC (1998) Successful knowledge management projects. *MIT Sloan Management Rev.* 39(2):43–57.

DeHoratius N, Raman A (2008) Inventory record inaccuracy: An empirical analysis. *Management Sci.* 54(4):627–641.

Demian P, Fruchter R (2006) An ethnographic study of design knowledge reuse in the architecture, engineering, and construction industry. *Res. Engrg. Design* 16(4):184–195.

Devaraj S, Kohli R (2003) Performance impacts of information technology: Is actual usage the missing link? *Management Sci.* 49(3):273–289.

Ethiraj SK, Kale P, Krishnan MS, Singh JV (2005) Where do capabilities come from and how do they matter? A study in the software services industry. *Strategic Management J.* 26(1):25–45.

Faraj S, Sproull L (2000) Coordinating expertise in software development teams. *Management Sci.* 46(12):1554–1568.

Festinger L, Schachter S, Back KW (1963) *Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA).

Fishbein M, Ajzen I (1975) *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research* (Addison-Wesley, Boston).

Fleming L, King III C, Juda AI (2007) Small worlds and regional innovation. *Organ. Sci.* 18(6):938–954.

Friedman TL (2005) *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*, 1st ed. (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York).

Gardner HK, Gino F, Staats BR (2012) Dynamically integrating knowledge in teams: Transforming resources into performance. *Acad. Management J.* 55(4):998–1022.

Gibson C, Cohen SG (2003) *Virtual Teams That Work: Creating Conditions for Virtual Team Effectiveness* (Jossey Bass, Hoboken, NJ).

Gibson C, Vermeulen F (2003) A healthy divide: Subgroups as a stimulus for team learning behavior. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 48(2): 202–239.

Gibson CB, Gibbs JL (2006) Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 51(3):451–495.

Gino F, Argote L, Miron-Spektor E, Todorova G (2010) First, get your feet wet: The effects of learning from direct and indirect experience on team creativity. *Organ. Behav. Human Decision Processes* 111(2):102–115.

Gray PH, Durcikova A (2005) The role of knowledge repositories in technical support environments: Speed versus learning in user performance. *J. Management Inform. Systems* 22(3):159–190.

Haas MR, Hansen MT (2007) Different knowledge, different benefits: Toward a productivity perspective on knowledge sharing in organizations. *Strategic Management J.* 28(11):1133–1153.

Hansen MT, Haas MR (2001) Competing for attention in knowledge markets: Electronic document dissemination in a management consulting company. *Admin. Sci. Quart.* 46(1):1–28.

Heeks R (2015) Indian IT/software sector statistics: 1980–2015 time series data. Accessed June 18, 2018, https://ict4dblog.wordpress.com/2015/04/28/indian-itsoftware-sector-statistics-1980-2015-time-series-data/.

Hinds PJ, Bailey DE (2003) Out of sight, out of sync: Understanding conflict in distributed teams. *Organ. Sci.* 14(6):615–632.

Hollingshead AB (1996) Information suppression and status persistence in group decision making—The effects of communication media. *Human Comm. Res.* 23(2):193–219.

Huckman RS, Pisano GP (2006) The firm specificity of individual performance: Evidence from cardiac surgery. *Management Sci.* 52(4):473–488.

Huckman RS, Staats BR (2011) Fluid tasks and fluid teams: The impact of diversity in experience and team familiarity on team performance. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 13(3): 310–328.

Huckman RS, Staats BR, Upton DM (2009) Team familiarity, role experience, and performance: Evidence from Indian software services. *Management Sci.* 55(1):85–100.

Ibarra H (1997) Paving an alternative route: Gender differences in managerial networks. *Soc. Psych. Quart.* 60(1):91–102.

Kang S, Lim KH, Kim MS, Yang H-D (2012) Research note—A multilevel analysis of the effect of group appropriation on collaborative technologies use and performance. *Inform. Systems Res.* 23(1):214–230.

Kanter RM (1993) *Men and Women of the Corporation: New Edition* (Basic Books, New York).

Kiesler S, Cummings J, eds. (2002) *What Do We Know About Proximity and Distance in Work Groups?* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA).

Kleinfeld JS (2002) The small world problem. *Society* 39(2):61–66.

Ko D-G, Dennis AR (2011) Profiting from knowledge management: The impact of time and experience. *Inform. Systems Res.* 22(1):134–152.

Kulkarni UR, Ravindran S, Freeze R (2006) A knowledge management success model: Theoretical development and empirical validation. *J. Management Inform. Systems* 23(3):309–347.

Levenson A (2012) Talent management: Challenges of building cross-functional capability in high-performance work systems environments. *Asia Pacific J. Human Resources* 50(2):187–204.

Lewis K, Lange D, Gillis L (2005) Transactive memory systems, learning, and learning transfer. *Organ. Sci.* 16(6):581–598.

MacCormack A, Verganti R, Iansiti M (2001) Developing products on "Internet time": The anatomy of a flexible development process. *Management Sci.* 47(1):133–150.

Majchrzak A, Malhotra A, John R (2005a) Perceived individual collaboration know-how development through information technology-enabled contextualization: Evidence from distributed teams. *Inform. Systems Res.* 16(1):9–27.

Majchrzak A, Malhotra A, John R (2005b) Perceived individual collaboration know-how development through information technology–enabled contextualization. *Inform. Systems Res.* 16(1):9–27.

Malhotra A, Majchrzak A, Carman R, Lott V (2001) Radical innovation without collocation: A case study at Boeing-Rocketdyne. *MIS Quart.* 25(2):229–249.

Markus ML (2001) Toward a theory of knowledge reuse: Types of knowledge reuse situations and factors in reuse success. *J. Management Inform. Systems* 18(1):57–93.

Martins LL, Gilson LL, Maynard MT (2004) Virtual teams: What do we know and where do we go from here? *J. Management* 30(6):805–835.

Milgram S (1967) The small world problem. *Phychology Today* 1(1): 61–67.

Mortensen M, Neeley T (2012) Reflected knowledge and trust in global collaboration. *Management Sci.* 58(12):2207–2224.

Murphy J, Hackbush J (2007) The knowledge management spending report, 2007–2008. *AMR Res.* (September 24), https://www.gartner.com/doc/1340554/knowledge-management-spending-report-market.

NASSCOM (2015) NASSCOM industry trends. Accessed June 18, 2018, http://www.digitalcreed.in/nasscom-optimistic-about-growth-for-the-indian-it-bpm-industry/.

O'Leary MB, Cummings JN (2007) The spatial, temporal, and configurational characteristics of geographic dispersion in teams. *MIS Quart.* 31(3):433–452.

O'Leary MB, Mortensen M (2010) Go (con)figure: Subgroups, imbalance, and isolates in geographically dispersed teams. *Organ. Sci.* 21(1):115–131.

Orlikowski WJ (2002) Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organ. Sci.* 13(3):249–273.

Pisano GP, Bohmer RMJ, Edmondson AC (2001) Organizational differences in rates of learning: Evidence from the adoption of minimally invasive cardiac surgery. *Management Sci.* 47(6):752–768.

Podolny JM, Baron JN (1997) Resources and relationships: Social networks and mobility in the workplace. *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 673–693.

Rabe-Hesketh S, Skrondal A (2008) *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata* (STATA Press, College Station, TX).

Raudenbush SW, Bryk AS (2002) *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods* (Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA).

Ready DA, Hill LA, Conger JA (2008) Winning the race for talent in emerging markets. *Harvard Bus. Rev.* 86(11):62–70.

Reagans R (2011) Close encounters: Analyzing how social similarity and propinquity contribute to strong network connections. *Organ. Sci.* 22(4):835–849.

Reagans R, Argote L, Brooks D (2005) Individual experience and experience working together. *Management Sci.* 51(6):869–881.

Siemsen E, Roth AV, Balasubramanian S, Anand G (2009) The influence of psychological safety and confidence in knowledge on employee knowledge sharing. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 11(3):429–447.

Singh J, Hansen MT, Podolny JM (2010) The world is not small for everyone: Inequity in searching for knowledge in organizations. *Management Sci.* 56(9):1415–1438.

Staats BR (2012) Unpacking team familiarity: The effects of geographic location and hierarchical role. *Production Oper. Management* 21(3):619–635.

Staats BR, Brunner DJ, Upton DM (2011) Lean principles, learning, and knowledge work: Evidence from a software services provider. *J. Oper. Management* 29(5):376–390.

Stein EW, Zwass V (1995) Actualizing organizational memory with information systems. *Inform. Systems Res.* 6(2):85–117.

Travers J, Milgram S (1969) An experimental study of the small world problem. *Sociometry* 32(4):425–443.

Tucker AL (2007) An empirical study of system improvement by frontline employees in hospital units. *Manufacturing Service Oper. Management* 9(4):492–505.

Wegner DM (1987) Transactive memory: A contemporary analysis of the group mind. Mullen G, Goethals G, eds. *Theories of Group Behavior* (Springer-Verlag, New York), 185–208.