Editorial

Kaj U. Koskinen

Industrial Management and Engineering,
Tampere University of Technology, Pori,
P.O. Box 300, Pohjoisranta 11, FI-28101 Pori, Finland
Fax: +358 2 627 2727
E-mail: kaj.koskinen@tut.fi

Knowledge management in projects is nowadays a prerequisite to sustain a competitive advantage in project-based companies. It is argued that without managing knowledge in projects, knowledge assets can be lost when a project is completed. However, in project-based companies and projects in general, the activities like knowledge acquisition and sharing, which are a part of knowledge management, are often very complex tasks. This is due to the fact that project teams are often a set of diversely skilled people working together over a limited period of time and they often include members who have never worked together before and who do not expect to work together again.

Published research and case studies on knowledge management focus overwhelmingly on large functional corporations, and it is by no means clear that what works for them is a good approach for a project work and project-based companies. This special issue is intended to improve that situation by presenting 12 papers selected for publication. The papers reflect the state-of-the-art analysis of interface between project management and knowledge management from both theoretical and practical perspective.

I can distinguish two groups of papers in this special issue, namely theoretically oriented and practically oriented. The main ideas and conclusions of individual papers will follow in the orders corresponding to those two groups.

Jones and McKie advocate combining theoretical perspectives of complex responsive process theory and complex adaptive systems. According to these authors, these perspectives together stress the importance of project workers valuing both themselves and others in each local interaction, while at the same time understanding their location in a dynamic, systemic context. Jones and McKie develop and introduce the concept of 'intelligent participation' as a guiding framework for better cross-functional project team practise. Furthermore, they also address the limitations of the transmission model of communication and suggest a new vocabulary by focusing on knowledge as a communicative process rather than a transferred product.

Sense challenges the traditional view of projects and project teams as only being temporal and separate entities focused on achieving particular and tangible outcomes. According to him, such a limited perspective tends to overlook the generative learning and personal growth potential inherent within the project form. Based on a social constructivist learning perspective which embraces situated learning theory and communities of practise, Sense re-characterises projects. According to him, on-the-job learning and the socio-cultural conditions nurture projects in a way that move project work towards the forefront activities.

Koskinen's and Pihlanto's paper deals with knowledge sharing in different project work environments. These authors use holistic concept of man (HCM) as a tool for analysing the knowledge sharing. They claim that when studying knowledge sharing in a project work context, the three individual dimensions – consciousness, situationality and corporeality – of project team members should be understood and taken into consideration.

Cicmil and Gaggiotti ask who cares about project deadlines. In answering this question these authors have utilised interpretative methodology (narratology), and conceptual frameworks (sense-making and relational-processual approach) in developing alternative insights into the organisational members' experiences with collaborative project work. Cicmil and Gaggiotti suggest four factors/procedures by which work delays and project failures can be decreased.

Martinsuo and Kantolahti present a new framework for exploring the situated practise of knowledge integration between a change program and its parent organisation. The results gained from a test in a successful, complex change program, give evidence on the evolving nature of knowledge integration over the change program's lifecycle, both in the form of integration practises and program personnel's roles.

Sargis Roussel has used epistemological and ontological levels in explaining knowledge creation taking place in a cross-functional bank-sector project. The model developed by her, challenges linear models of knowledge transfer by demonstrating the embedded and embodied nature of knowledge and the interconnections among different project phases.

Fong and Wong examine whether knowledge and experience in building maintenance projects could be reused in a more effective and efficient way by forming a community of practise across organisations. They propose a web-based experience management system as a feasible solution in the sharing, capturing and reusing of knowledge and experience in building maintenance.

Adenfelt and Maaninen-Olsson show how communication is an inherent part of knowledge integration within a transnational business projects. They claim that from a management perspective it is important to recognise the importance of creating arenas and communication tools where both codified and tacit knowledge can be shared.

Christensen and Bukh focus on how managerial options in relation to development and sharing knowledge in projects can be extended by analysing project management from two different, but complementary, knowledge management perspectives: an artefact oriented and a process oriented perspective. They conclude that if a company offers standardised products, a codification strategy deriving from the artefact oriented perspective will be the most effective, whereas the personification strategy deriving from the process oriented perspective will be the most effective if a company offers customised solutions.

Liinamaa and Wikström present results from case studies of various knowledge integration mechanisms in industrial project business. The results are summarised in a framework describing two dimensions of knowledge integration: how the project is delivered and what is the final outcome. The framework emphasises both the technical and social dimensions of knowledge integration.

Much has been written about organisational cultures being the critical reason for the successes and failures of knowledge management within projects. However, more is needed. The research conducted by Christopian and Rahschulte broadens the extent to

constraining industries and organisations – like aerospace and defence industries – which have been appraised relative to cultural climates.

Aramo-Immonen's and Porkka's paper deals with the role of shared knowledge in value chains of project-based companies. On the basis of the results of the empirical study, they conclude that the communication inside the projects' value chains is not always sufficient to achieve proper fulfilment of customers' requirements.

I would like to thank the reviewers of this special issue. Without their assistance this project would not have been possible. I would also like to thank the contributors by allowing me to share the results of their research with the rest of the knowledge management and project management communities. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Dorgham, Mr. Jim Corlett and Mrs. Janet Marr from Inderscience Publishers for their support and assistance in the development of this special issue.