



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of High Technology Management Research



A social network perspective on the management of product development programs

Jan Kratzer^{a,*}, Roger Th.A.J. Leenders^{b,1}, Jo M.L. van Engelen^{b,1}

^a Berlin Institute of Technology, Strasse des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin, Germany

^b University of Groningen, P.O. Box 800, 9700 AV Groningen, The Netherlands

ARTICLE INFO

Available online 17 October 2009

Keywords:

Social Networks
Creativity
Product development programs
Space research
Regression

ABSTRACT

Creativity is essential to the performance of product development programs (PDPs). Most PDPs are designed around teams that jointly work together according to the product decomposition into components, the design and development procedure, and the methods of the final integration. Since the creative product development task requires the teams to combine and integrate input from multiple other teams, the team's structure of interaction is an important determinant of their creativity. In research and practice, however, little is known about the social networks of the teams and their creativity within PDPs. In this study we investigate different structural aspects of social networks of such teams and their creativity within two multinational PDPs. The main results of our investigation imply that many direct network contacts around a weekly intensity stimulate the creativity of teams of PDPs, whereas very open networks with a high information variety minimizes the team's creativity.

© 2009 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

In today's knowledge-intensive environments, Product Development Programs (PDPs) are increasingly employed for executing innovative efforts (Oxley and Sampson, 2004; Smith and Blanck, 2002), especially in multinational contexts. Engineering technically advanced and complex products requires the tapping and capitalizing of knowledge concentrated in pockets of excellence around the globe (Leenders, Van Engelen, & Kratzer, 2003). Increasing product complexity often requires increasing the number of specialists involved (Hoegl and Weinkauf, 2005). For example, the number of people involved in the development of the Volkswagen New Beatle Automobile reached around 1600 and for the Boeing 777 Airplane approximately 16,800 (Ulrich and Eppinger, 2004). Researchers and practitioners unanimously agree that effective management plays a critical role in the success of such PDPs (Pinto and Prescott, 1988). Unfortunately, the knowledge and experience base of most managers refer to smaller-scale projects consisting of only a few project teams. This may be responsible for what Flyvbjerg, Bruzelius, and Rothengatter (2003) call a 'performance paradox': "At the same time as many more and much larger infrastructure projects are being proposed and built around the world, it is becoming clear that many such projects have strikingly poor performance records" (p. 3).

PDPs typically follow a project-management like approach with the team as the organizational nucleus (e.g., Van Engelen, Kiewiet, & Terlouw, 2001). The information networks of these teams define the opportunities available to them to create new knowledge (e.g., Uzzi, 1996). As many scholars have argued, networks of organizational linkages are critical to a host of organizational processes and outcomes (e.g., Baum and Ingram, 1998; Darr, Argote, & Epple, 1995; Hansen, 1999; Reagans and McEvily, 2003; Szulanski, 1996). New knowledge is the result of creative achievements. Creativity, therefore, molds the foundation for poor or high degrees of performance. The extent to which teams in PDPs produce creative ideas depends not only on their internal processes and achievement, but also on the work environment in which they operate (e.g., Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, &

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +49 30 31426581.

E-mail addresses: jan.kratzer@tu-berlin.de (J. Kratzer), R.T.A.J.Leenders@rug.nl (R.T.A.J. Leenders), joovanegelen@mac.com (J.M.L. van Engelen).

¹ Tel.: +31 50 3637296.

Kramer, 2004; Perry-Smith and Shalley, 2003; Reiter-Palmon and Illies, 2004). Since new knowledge is mainly created when existing bases of information are disseminated through interaction between interacting teams with varying areas of expertise, creativity is couched in interaction networks (e.g., Leenders et al., 2003; Hansen, 1999; Ingram and Robert, 2000; Reagans and Zuckerman, 2001; Tsai, 2001; Uzzi, 1996).

There are many views of creativity. Amabile (1983) argues that creativity is exhibited when a product or service is generated that is both novel and useful with respect to the firm. Woodman, Sawyer, and Griffin (1993) contend that creativity refers to the creation of a valuable, useful new product, service, idea, procedure, or process by individuals working together in a complex social system. In the present research, we build on the definitions of Amabile (1983) and Woodman et al. (1993) and extend them with the very nature of the design process itself, with the number and the considered design solutions as a precondition for novel, valuable, and useful ideas (Pahl and Beitz, 1992).

In order to investigate exactly how the creative performance of teams inside PDPs depends on their embeddedness in interaction structure, we collected data on two PDPs in the space industry. The first (PDP A) consists of 27 teams scattered around the globe in seventeen countries. The second (PDP B) encompasses 23 teams across five countries. In the first part of the paper we discuss the networks of teams and review the existing literature on the topic. We then formulate propositions about the relationship between the networks of the teams and team creativity. In the second part of the paper we present our case study and perform explorative empirical analyses. Finally we discuss the results and draw both academic and practical conclusions.

Teams require information and knowledge as input and produce (different) information and knowledge as output. Our study looks at different structural features as potential vehicles of team creativity. In this way the study does not focus on the internal consistency of teams, but rather on a consistent set of network structures that emerge in interaction between a set of teams. In the literature it is well-documented that different network structures may serve different goals. As little is known about the network factors that determine new product team creativity, this study supplements both the NPD and creativity literatures and broadens the base of systematic research and empirical data (e.g., Gruen, 2004).

2. The social networks of teams in PDPs

The structural configuration of team networks in PDPs result from product decomposition into sub-components, the employed design and development procedures, and the methods of final integration into a new product (Browning, 2001). The two PDPs in our study are decomposed into 27 sub-components in PDP A and 23 sub-components in PDP B, with each component assigned to one team. Since the success of the complete product requires the creative input of all teams in a PDP, their creative capabilities are decisive to the success of the whole PDP. As we argue in this article, creativity is largely shaped by coordinated interaction among the teams. The differences in the networks of the various teams in PDP A are displayed in Fig. 1. In order to graphically illustrate distinguishable social networks we executed a k -core analysis of the network (Seidman, 1983). A k -core is a set of nodes that are more closely connected to one another than to nodes in other k -cores. That is, a k -core is one definition of a 'group' or 'sub-structure' inside an overall network. The size of the nodes in each k -core is proportional to the size of the k -core and the connectivity within the k -core. Graph theoretically, a k -core is a maximal group of teams, all of whom are connected to k other teams. This technique is often used to display large complex networks in a more organized manner. In Fig. 1, teams with many and very intense social contacts are characterized by larger-sized and darker nodes, whereas teams that are loosely connected with lower intensity are denoted by smaller-sized and lighter nodes. The interactions describe the exchange of product-related issues containing technical specifications, test results, technical problems et cetera, in other words problem-solving related information. The boldness of the lines indicates the strength of these interactions. From Fig. 1 it is clear that the various teams in PDP A each have very different networks. For example, team 1's network is denoted by many and strong contacts, whereas team 22 only has very few contacts and these contacts are on average less intense.

Interactions, however, are restricted by the availability of time and energy. So it may be important to reach many teams with little time and energy. Exactly this issue is addressed by the concept of 'network efficiency' (Burt, 1992). The main argument behind network efficiency is that since maintaining interactions requires time and energy an efficient distribution of contacts may make it possible to maintain more contacts and, consequently, have more access to information. Network efficiency refers to the ratio of the number of teams that can be reached and the number of contacts maintained by a team. Thus, network efficiency is high in case many teams can be reached with only a few linkages and lower when many more linkages lead to the same number of teams. For example, team 1 would need only thirteen of its current 23 links to reach all teams to which team 1 is currently connected through one (direct links) or two steps (first-order indirect contacts). The remaining ten links are redundant in the sense that they would only provide additional paths to the same teams team 1 is connected to already. The concept of network efficiency also includes the strength of ties, which is neglected here for ease of exposition. In the next section we will develop propositions relating these network structures to team creativity.

3. The social networks of PDP teams and creativity: propositions

In spite of the growing consensus that networks matter (Ahuja, 2000), the specific effects of different elements of network structure on creativity remain widely unclear. In the social network literature, a debate has arisen over the network structures that can appropriately be regarded as beneficial (Walker, Kogut, & Shan, 1997). According to one view, close networks with many strong connections linking teams are seen as advantageous (e.g., Coleman, 1988). The alternative view, however, states that advantages derive from the opportunities created by an open social structure (e.g., Burt, 1992). Teams can build contacts with

دريافت فوري

متن كامل مقاله



- ✓ امكان دانلود نسخه تمام مقالات انگلیسي
- ✓ امكان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذيرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصي
- ✓ امكان جستجو در آرشيو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امكان دانلود رايگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امكان پرداخت اينترنتی با کليه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوري مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاين
- ✓ پشتيباني كامل خريد با بهره مندي از سيسitem هوشمند رهگيري سفارشات