

A Literature Review: Exploring the Influence of Trust on Knowledge Sharing in Project Teams within Project-based Organisations

Dr. Geraldine Hamill Cunnane

Lecturer

School of Business and Law, Dublin Business School
Dublin, Ireland

© Author. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>.

Abstract

The characterisation of knowledge as the primary productive resource of organisations rather than capital, natural resources, or labour, has prompted an increase in the interest of knowledge, however, it is acknowledged that it is in the sharing of knowledge where the value is held. From this perspective, it is conceded that knowledge sharing amongst team members as an intangible asset, has the power to maintain and sustain organisational growth, and survival. Therefore, the factors which enable or inhibit knowledge sharing among team members needs to be identified. Trust has been recognised as a prominent influencing factor on knowledge sharing and it is here where the focus of this literature review lies. This paper offers a review of the literature on knowledge sharing in teams, presenting enabling and inhibiting factors, giving prominence to trust. Trust is investigated to include the role of trust in teams and in knowledge sharing and factors which enables and inhibits the development of trust.

Keywords: Knowledge management, Corporations--Growth, Management,

Introduction

Organisations currently face challenges from volatile economies, rapid technological advancements, and increasingly complex environmental responsibilities. This uncertain and dynamic environment compels organisations to quickly and effectively adapt to survive and thrive (Teece et al., 2016). In this context, Peter Drucker's (1993) research highlights the importance of knowledge as the primary productive resource for organisations, surpassing traditional resources like capital, natural resources, and

labour. This recognition has underscored the growing value of knowledge in driving organisational success.

Knowledge is recognised as an essential for creating competitive advantage (Argote and Ingram, 2000; Davenport and Prusak, 2005; Wang et al., 2014; Azeem et al., 2021) and needs to be situated in an environment where it is cared for (Davenport and Prusak, 2005). Hence, understanding how to maximise knowledge will dictate an organisation's capacity for growth and survival (Swart et al., 2014). While knowledge resides within the individual (Grant, 1996), new emphasis has foregrounded the sharing of knowledge of individuals within a team. This enhances the value of knowledge (Yesil, 2019), thereby forming greater knowledge (i.e., collective knowledge) than would otherwise be possible (Kogut and Zander, 1992; Argote and Ingram, 2000; Senge, 2006). Subsequently, the practice of knowledge sharing has become a key focus within organisations as well as academic research (Nonaka, 1994; Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar 2016; Anwar et al., 2019).

Organisations actively encourage team members to share knowledge, as this practice is crucial for enhancing value and achieving organisational success. Knowledge sharing leads to improvements in team dynamics and project outcomes (Lee et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2015), fosters team innovation (Rahmi and Indarti, 2019), boosts employee creativity (Zeb et al., 2019), and strengthens organisational commitment and learning (Curado and Vieira, 2019; Swift and Hwang, 2013). Additionally, it facilitates effective organisational changes (Park and Kim, 2015) and leverages the collective knowledge of the organisation (Mishra and Bhaskar, 2011), which is closely linked to enhanced overall performance (Mueller, 2014).

In specific organisational sectors and business environments, knowledge sharing is a core aspect of the business structure. Companies in the engineering, procurement, and construction (EPC) sectors tend to adopt project-based structures (Hobday, 2000; Sydow et al., 2004) and rely heavily on knowledge sharing (Ajmal and Koskinen, 2008) given that the completion of a project task requires more than one skill. Knowledge sharing in project teams is important because it offers insights for future projects (Schindler and Eppler, 2003). In general, each project in project-based organisations (PBOs) is unique in character (Project Management Body of Knowledge, 2021). PBOs must deal with change on a regular basis. In turn, these changes provide a platform for gaining new knowledge through sharing (Terzieva, 2014). Despite the recognized importance of knowledge sharing within PBOs, achieving it can be difficult (Argote and Ingram, 2000; Wittenbaum et al., 2004; Mueller, 2014). This difficulty is due to factors that can hinder the practice of knowledge sharing, which, in turn, may harm organisations by depicting them as inefficient (Rutten et al., 2016). Therefore,

understanding the factors which enable and inhibit effective knowledge sharing practices has important implications for the longevity of a PBOs, hence such organisations need to acknowledge such factors.

One particular factor, trust, is regarded as a central factor which influences an individual's decision to share knowledge (Kipkosgei et al., 2020, Rutten et al., 2016). Academic researchers have shown much interest in studying the relationship between trust and knowledge sharing (Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar 2016; Anwar et al., 2019), this is no doubt partially driven by the evidence of its potential benefits. Trust has been found to increase knowledge sharing among team members (Ma et al., 2008; Rutten et al., 2016), which is attributed to improving organisational performance (Mueller, 2014). Accordingly, this literature review aims to examine trust and how it influences knowledge sharing amongst project team members within PBOs.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: It commences with a review of the literature pertaining to the definition of knowledge sharing. It explores the nature of knowledge relevant to knowledge sharing and details the complexities of knowledge sharing. Next, the author moves to the factors that can inhibit or enable the practice of knowledge sharing. Having sifted through the literature the author directs the focus to trust as the central factor influencing the practice of knowledge sharing amongst project team members. Finally, trust is examined as relevant to knowledge sharing in project teams.

Defining Knowledge Sharing

The existing literature includes many different accounts of knowledge sharing (Mc Dermott, 1999; Argote and Ingram, 2000). Knowledge sharing can be characterised as a process controlled by the individual (Swart et al., 2014), which requires the individual's willingness to collaborate with others (Zboralski, 2009). Knowledge sharing is referred to as the act of making knowledge available to others (Ipe, 2003) through the exchange of information, skills, or expertise (Caruso, 2017), and subsequently communicating knowledge (Xue et al., 2011). Knowledge sharing enriches (Davenport and Prusak, 2005) and influences the receiver of the knowledge. Ultimately, it contributes to the development of individual skills, ideas, and expertise (Argote and Ingram, 2000). Similarly, knowledge sharing has been described as a reciprocal process of exchange (Renzl, 2006) or as an activity of transferring or disseminating knowledge from one person, group, or organisation to another (Joshi et al., 2006).

The emphasis of knowledge sharing in organisational teams, was characterised by Srivastava et al. (2006) as a process where team members share task-related ideas, information, and suggestions with each other. This involves integrating new knowledge with existing knowledge that, in turn, redefines existing knowledge (Swart et al., 2014). Knowledge sharing improves team decision making; thus, alternative options based on other team members' experience can be considered (Lee et al., 2010). Lee et al. (2015, p. 3) explained that "members of a team share knowledge with one another when they have access to other team members through which they can garner and integrate knowledge and can anticipate value through sharing". Nonaka (1994) argued that team members play a significant role in the sharing of knowledge. Finally, knowledge sharing has been recognised to foster organisational commitment and learning (Curado and Vieira, 2019).

The Nature of Knowledge in Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing requires an understanding of the structure of knowledge. Often the terms knowledge and information are equated and are treated as having the same meaning. Hence, they are used interchangeably (Huber, 1991). However, there are important differences between these terms. Information can be defined as a flow of messages that may take several forms, such as written documents or verbal communications, without any critical evaluation of the messages involved. By contrast, knowledge is information transformed into meaningful and relevant content through analytic modes that are used by individuals as well as groups or teams (Davenport and Prusak, 2005).

Knowledge can be categorised into two types: explicit and tacit (Polanyi, 1966). Explicit knowledge is formal, systematic, and can be easily communicated through data, regulations, policies, manuals, patents, blueprints, reports, and other accessible sources (Maravilhas and Martins, 2019). It involves well-defined information that can be readily shared (Grant, 1996). In contrast, tacit knowledge is intangible, complex, and challenging to share (Jugdev and Wishart, 2014; Maravilhas and Martins, 2019). It is deeply personal and encompasses routines, habits (Adloff et al., 2015), intuitions, and hunches (Maravilhas and Martins, 2019). Tacit knowledge is often tied to individual beliefs, values (Nonaka, 1994; Desouza, 2003), technical skills, and experience (Chugh, 2015), making it subjective and elusive. People often find it difficult to articulate their tacit knowledge, not due to unwillingness but because of its complex nature (Argyris and Schön, 1996). Furthermore, tacit knowledge is context-specific, depending on who is involved and how they engage (von Krogh et al., 2000), as well as being tied to particular times and situations (Nonaka, 1994). It is also dynamic, evolving as it interacts with experiences, insights, and other information, and acquiring

unique characteristics over time. Thus, tacit knowledge can be seen as evolving with its environment, almost like a living entity (Davenport and Prusak, 2005).

The focus of this literature review is on knowledge sharing amongst project team members; therefore it is important to consider the enablers and inhibitors of knowledge sharing.

Enablers and Inhibitors of Knowledge Sharing

Sharing knowledge is a fragile and complex process, which is dependent on an understanding of the enablers as well as the potential inhibitors which influence the practice.

Enablers of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing enablers are factors at the individual, team, and/or organisational level which improve and/or encourage the knowledge holder's willingness to share knowledge. Such factors, if implemented correctly, will significantly contribute to the knowledge sharing process (Cavaliere et al., 2015). Table 1 below summarises the enablers of knowledge sharing identified within the literature.

Table 1: Knowledge Sharing Enablers

Enablers of Knowledge Sharing	Author/Year
Trust	Meyerson et al. (1996), Renzl (2006), Lee et al., (2010), Swift and Hwang (2013), Casimir et al. (2012), Wickramasinghe and Widiyaratne (2012), Rosendaal and Biilsma-Frankema (2013), Rutten et al. (2016), Olaisen and Revang (2017), Ouakouak and Ouedraogo (2018), Phung et al. (2019), Zeb et al. (2019), Carmeli et al. (2020)
Team leader attributes	Lee et al. (2010), Xue et al. (2011), Cavaliere et al (2015), Zeb et al. (2019)
Relationships	Swift and Hwang (2013), Olaisen and Revang (2017)
Collaboration	Chen et al. (2014)
Cognitive diversity - different thinking styles	Rahmi and Indarti (2019)
Knowledge heterogeneity - differences in background knowledge	Wu et al. (2015)
Team identification	Rosendaal and Biilsma-Frankema (2013)
Cultural diversity	Bogilović et al. (2017)

While there are a number of enabling factors, trust is recognised as the most significant influence on knowledge sharing and is also important to other factors that impact knowledge sharing (Chen et al., 2014; Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar, 2016; Ouakouak and Ouedraogo, 2018; Anwar et al., 2019). Empirical research found high levels of trust between co-workers resulted in more knowledge being shared (Rutten et al., 2016; Wickremesinghe and Widyaratne's, 2012) and induced the sharing of knowledge to occur faster (Zeb et al., 2019). According to Rosendaal and Biilsma-Frankema, (2013) trust enables knowledge sharing, particularly when the knowledge sharer trusts the recipients not to exploit the shared knowledge for their individual benefit. Furthermore, within the context of a virtual team, trust influences the practice of knowledge sharing (Olaisen and Revang, 2017). Delving deeper into different types of trust and their influence on knowledge sharing, prior studies draw on McAllister's (1995) two-dimensional model of trust: cognitive-based (based on reason and competence) and affective-based (based on care and concern). Swift and Hwang (2013) found affective-based trust to be the main determinant for knowledge to be shared. These findings are consistent with Casimir et al. 's (2012) research, which found that affective-based trust improves knowledge sharing behaviour as well as performance between colleagues. It is evident from the literature that trust has a significant positive influence on knowledge sharing. Additionally, there are factors which can inhibit the knowledge sharing process therefore, it is necessary to acknowledge such factors.

Inhibitors of Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing inhibitors are factors which restrict or prevent the knowledge holder's willingness to share knowledge and, therefore, may prevent the organisation from reaching its full potential. Table 2 below summarises the main inhibitors of knowledge sharing.

Table 2: Knowledge Sharing Inhibitors

Inhibitors of Knowledge Sharing	Author/Year
Hoarding knowledge: Fear of losing one's unique value Maintaining power and authority Lack of facilitation and motivation	Renzl (2006), Muqadas et al. (2016), Qureshi and Evans (2015)
Poor leadership	Qureshi and Evans (2015), Boies et al. (2015)
Lack of interpersonal trust and Distrust	Connelly et al. (2012), Qureshi and Evans, (2015), Rutten et al. (2016)
Lack of time	Cleveland and Eilis (2015), Qureshi and Evans (2015)
Lack of relationship, competitiveness	Yesil and Hatunoğlu (2019)
Organisational culture	Wei and Miraglia (2017)
Low cultural diversity	Bogilovic (2017)
Lack of communication skills	Cleveland and Eilis (2015)
Technological barriers	Al Attar and Shaalan (2016)

Knowledge hoarding, poor leadership, and lack of trust are among the most prominent factors identified from the literature which inhibit knowledge sharing. Knowledge hoarding is the intentional act of not sharing knowledge for fear of losing one's unique value (Renzl, 2006) and for the purpose of maintaining power and authority (Muqadas et al., 2016). Additionally, knowledge is less likely to be shared among team members when supervised by leaders of a bureaucratic nature than team members engaging with nonsupervisory leaders (Boies et al., 2015).

As previously discussed, trust is an important enabler, therefore it is not surprising that a lack of trust in organisations can impede the process of knowledge sharing (Qureshi and Evans, 2015), while the existence of low levels of trust between co-workers leads to less knowledge sharing (Rutten et al., 2016). Connelly et al. (2012) suggested that distrust between colleagues induces the act of knowledge hiding from which knowledge is not shared. Trust has proven to be the main inhibitor to knowledge being shared (Asrar-ul-Haq and Anwar, 2016).

Therefore, trust is an important factor to consider when examining knowledge sharing amongst project team members. In the next section trust will be examined through: the conceptualisation of trust, the enablers and inhibitors of trust, and the role of trust in knowledge sharing in teams.

The Conceptualisation of Trust

A substantial body of research pertaining to trust using various definitions and structures has been conducted across multiple disciplines, industries, and sectors. Within this, there is some collective consensus relating to the composition of trust (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015) insofar as trust is recognised as being multifaceted (Mayer et al., 1995; Lewicki and Bunker, 1996; Costa, 2003), involving a dyadic relationship (i.e., the willingness of one party to accept vulnerability), and evolving over a period of time through an individual's repeated positive experience with another (Mayer et al. 1995; Lewicki et al., 1998). Mayer et al. (1995) characterised trust as a risk-taking action reflecting "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (p. 712). The authors also acknowledged that a team member's assessment of a fellow colleague's (trustee) trustworthiness can be appraised based on three dimensions: integrity, ability, and benevolence. Integrity refers to a set of principles the trustee adheres to, and the trustor finds acceptable. Ability refers to the skill set and competence one displays. Benevolence implies a connection between team members with the understanding that each member wants to do good (Mayer et al., 1995).

Similarly, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) associated the development of trust with the development of a professional working relationship following three sequential stages: calculus-based trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust. Calculus-based trust is based on the integrity of the team member. Knowledge-based trust is based on familiarity through interactions of team members, which develops over time. This is followed by identification-based trust, which takes place when team members acknowledge that one member can act on behalf of another. Mayer et al. 's (1995)

integrity and ability compares with Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) calculus and knowledge-based trust, which develops early in a working relationship. Also, Mayer et al.'s (1995) benevolence-based trust aligns with Lewicki and Bunker's (1996) identification-based trust, which takes time to develop and, therefore, occurs at a later stage of a working relationship (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015). Thus, it can be ascertained that trust develops over time based on an individual's repeated positive behaviour through professional working relationships (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015).

Meyerson et al. (1996) asserted that a unique form of trust – that is not behaviour and time dependent – exists within a temporary team environment, where team members still experience the advantage of trust through the development of swift trust. Meyerson and colleagues argued that swift trust has two requirements in order for it to occur: (a) team composition, which consists of limited working history, prospects of working together again, team size, and diverse talent; and (b) team tasking, which consists of complex tasks, that are non-routine, and time bound. Berthold (2015) viewed swift trust as an enabler in developing fast team trust, which develops immediately between interdependent team members who work together but have limited or no prior knowledge or shared experience. Swift trust is an individual's initial trust perception (Robert et al., 2009) which is developed through a category-based process built on a team members' characteristics, such as title, expertise, and specialised roles, where individuals subconsciously place team members into a category and assume trust based on that category (Meyerson et al., 1996). Category-based processing develops out of a long-term association predominantly from past experience (Robert et al., 2009).

McLaren and Loosemore's (2019) research further supports the development of swift trust through category matching where reputation and clear roles have been identified as central to the formation of swift trust within temporary project teams. Swift trust is a presumed form of trust from which team members with restricted encounters must place confidence in other team members' capabilities (Germain, 2011). Additionally, swift trust has been recognised as a necessity to kick start virtual project teams into action (Crisp and Jarvenpaa, 2013) whereby the team members understand that they must trust each other to complete a project (Atkinson et al., 2006) therefore, any uncertainties towards team members must be set aside in order to complete an objective (Germain, 2011). Swift trust is acknowledged as a precipitated trust rather than a gradual development of trust through positive experience (Meyerson et al., 1996), which implies that swift trust is imported. Robert et al. (2009) provided empirical evidence to support category-based processing i.e. swift trust, generates high initial trust perceptions within virtual project teams. Interestingly, Robert et al. (2009) showed that as the team members become more familiar with each other, swift trust can

change into knowledge-based (ability, benevolence, and integrity) trust. Pursuing the same line and context of research as Robert et al. (2009) and Zakaria and Yusof (2020) findings suggest the development and depletion of swift trust happens quickly and depending on the correct conditions is replaced by a resilient longer lasting trust.

Enablers and Inhibitors of Trust in a Team

Studies suggest there are a number of enablers of trust. Table 3 below summarises the enablers of trust within a team identified from the literature.

Table 3: Enablers of trust in teams

Enablers of Trust	Author/Year
Shared vision	Hsu et al. [JR1] (2011), Rios-Ballesteros and Fuerst, (2022).
Communication	Germain (2011)
Intellectual ability and agreeableness	Naber et al. (2018)
Feedback	Geister et al. (2006)
Prior positive relationships	Buvik and Rolfsen (2015)
Adhering to team rules	Walther and Bunz (2005)
Team diversity	Dayan and Di Benedetto (2010)
Co-operative behaviour	Costa (2003), Naber et al. (2018)
Leadership	Lee et al. (2010), Phung et al. (2019), Islam, et al. (2021), Legood et al. (2020).

Hsu et al., (2011) and Rios-Ballesteros and Fuerst's (2022) research suggests that a shared vision (i.e., common beliefs and values) among team members acts as a strong influencer of trust development. Team communication has been shown to enhance team trust (Germain, 2011). Naber et al. (2018) found that team members with greater intellectual abilities were trusted more than those with lesser intellectual ability. Geister et al. (2006) asserted that exchanging information through team feedback facilitated

team trust building. Also, familiarity between team members through prior positive working relationships has been shown to engender trust (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015). According to Walther and Bunz (2005), adhering to team rules acts as a contributing factor for building team trust. Dayan and Di Benedetto (2010) suggested that demographic diversity in teams (e.g., age, gender, and ethnicity) increases trust among team members. Team members who tend to get along with others in a team, thereby nurturing harmonious team relationships, had a significant positive effect on trust development (Naber et al., 2018). Similarly, Costa’s (2003) research found that cooperative behaviour within teams was a strong component of trust. Furthermore, research suggests that leadership practices influence the building of trust in teams (Lee et al., 2010; Legood et al., 2020; Islam et al., 2021).

Inhibitors of Trust in a Team

Similarly, studies suggest there are a number of inhibitors of trust. Table 4 below summarises the inhibitors of trust within a team identified from the literature.

Table 4: Inhibitors of trust in teams

Inhibitors of Trust	Author/Year
Language barrier	Tenzer et al. (2014)
Control systems	Schoorman et al. (2007), Jørgensen and Åsgård (2019)
Communication medium	Hill et al. (2009)
Deep level diversity (attitudes and values)	Pinjani and Palvia (2013)
Intellectual ability, co-operative behaviour	Naber et al. (2018)
Knowledge sharing	Rutten et al. (2016)
Team conflict	Langfred (2007)

Tenzer et al.’s (2014) research suggested that the lack of a common language between team members acts as an inhibitor to the emergence of trust. Schoorman et al. (2007) as well as Jørgensen and Åsgård (2019) asserted that organisations with

mechanisms in place to control the progress of work impede trust building. Hill et al. (2009) showed that virtual team introductions display lower levels of trust than face-to-face team introductions. Also, team members displaying low levels of intellectual abilities were trusted less than those displaying higher levels of intellectual ability (Naber et al., 2018). According to Pinjani and Palvia (2013), team member heterogeneity with respect to deep-level diversity (i.e., preferences, attitudes, and values) displays low trust levels. Naber et al. (2018) showed that non-agreeable team members were trusted less than agreeable team members. Furthermore, Rutten et al. (2016) asserted that lower levels of knowledge sharing correlates with lower levels of trust between team members. Additionally, relationship conflict has been shown to lead to less trust between team members (Langfred, 2007).

The Role of Trust in Teams

Trust influences knowledge sharing within teams (Ma et al., 2008; Park and Lee, 2014; Rutten et al., 2016). Additionally, trust among team members contributes positively to the success of the organisation in that trust improves team and task performance (Mach et al., 2010; Boies et al., 2015), team commitment (Sheng and Noe, 2010), and organisational commitment (Curado and Vieira, 2019). Trust has been linked with higher levels of team creativity (Barczak et al., 2010). Moreover, trust in team members and team leaders engenders team identification, from which trust promotes collective (we) as opposed to singular (I) thinking (Rosendaal and Biilsma-Frankema, 2013). Furthermore, trust acts as an important factor towards team climate (Xue et al, 2011). The literature acknowledges trust as an important factor towards the functioning of teams in organisations, but more specifically acknowledges that trust influences knowledge sharing in teams.

The Role of Trust in Knowledge Sharing in Teams

Research pertaining to trust and knowledge sharing among team members suggests that trust has been associated with improving team relations (Hsu et al., 2011) and building cohesion among team members (Zand, 1971; Mach et al., 2010). This tends to enhance team members' willingness to help each other; in turn, knowledge is more likely to be shared (Xue et al., 2011). Rutten et al. (2016) related higher levels of trust in team members with higher levels of knowledge being shared; hence, trust increases knowledge sharing among team members (Ma et al., 2008; Rutten et al., 2016). Therefore, it can be concluded that individuals share knowledge with those whom they trust (Ali et al., 2018). It has been acknowledged that trust is significantly associated with knowledge sharing in teams.

Although there are many studies pertaining to the influence of trust towards knowledge sharing in teams, few studies have examined trust and knowledge sharing within teams that are of a temporary nature; such as project teams. It is within the context of temporary project teams in PBOs where this literature review interests lie.

Project-Based Organisations

Within project-based organisations (PBOs), project team members rely on each other to accomplish a team task within a restricted period (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015). The interdependent nature of project teams suggests that team members are vulnerable because they rely on other team members to complete the team task. Additionally, when team members work interdependently, knowledge needs to be shared. The literature highlights trust among team members as a prominent factor enabling team knowledge sharing. As previously discussed, trust is acclaimed to be a gradual process that develops over time through prior positive working encounters (experiences) (Mayer et al., 1995; Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). Moreover, trust cannot be created by force (Sheng and Noe, 2010). This poses a challenge for a PBO project team because of its temporary structural nature, which may not allow positive working encounters time to develop, which makes trust difficult to achieve.

The PBO structure differs from other business organisations in that projects are the central unit of production, and the particular project needs to determine the PBO's structure (Hobday, 2000). Often a discipline or skill external to the PBO is needed to complete the project. To source such skillsets, PBOs may liaise with external sources such as recruitment agencies. Once an external source is identified, the PBO may employ that source on a contractual basis for the project's duration. During that time, that contractor becomes a temporary part of the project team. While some team members may have had previous work experience with the contractor, others may not (Buvik and Rolfsen, 2015). In any case, once the project is complete, the team members disperse (Argyris, 1999; Ajmal and Koskinen, 2008; Kitimbo and Dalkir, 2013), and the contract team member leaves. When the team disbands, external team members who have contributed critical inputs to the project leave; thus, knowledge that may be beneficial to future projects cannot be shared (Schindler and Eppler, 2003) by those team members in the future. The temporal and changing nature of project team members in a PBO environment inhibits the development of trusting relationships (Kitimbo and Dalkir, 2013). Thus, relevant knowledge sharing may not take place, which is highly problematic.

Time and previous positive experiences are conditions presumed necessary for trust to develop in teams. The absence of such conditions would suggest low levels of initial

trust in project teams, which, in turn, may lead to low levels of knowledge sharing (Rutten et al., 2016). Thus, although PBOs are successful at project performance, evidence suggests that they lack the informal and/or formal practice of sharing experiences and knowledge (Hobday, 2000, Davidavičienė et al., 2020). The literature review indicates a lack of understanding of how trust develops and influences knowledge sharing in project teams within PBOs.

In PBOs where various project team members, with different skills and different backgrounds, interact, an enabling trusting context is difficult to achieve. However, it has been shown that temporary project team members often display high levels of trusting behaviour, almost immediately initiating trust without establishing the acclaimed conditions of time and previous positive experience (Meyerson et al., 1996; McLaren and Loosemore, 2019). However, here lies the puzzle: the conditions that lead to trust — time and previous positive experiences — are required for trust to develop (Mayer et al., 1995; Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). Trust must also pre-exist between project team members for knowledge sharing to occur (Nonaka, 1994;, Zeb et al. 2019). However, the short-term nature of project team members within PBOs makes it difficult to develop trust because trust has not had time to evolve from past working experiences. Therefore, this situation challenges the perceived conventional understanding of how trust is developed (Meyerson et al., 1996). Thus, this literature review contributes to the debate as to whether temporary teams (i.e., project teams) need different processes to build trust.

As discussed, the literature recognises trust as a critical construct that influences the knowledge-sharing process in teams. Additionally, a number of enablers and inhibitors that influence the development of trust have been identified. From the literature it is unclear whether: the development of trust within teams of a temporary nature – project teams – is influenced by the same factors of trust that apply to non-temporary teams.

Conclusion

This paper presents a comprehensive literature review on knowledge sharing within teams, with a specific focus on the role of trust as a critical influencing factor. Despite the wealth of research on knowledge sharing in teams, there is a noticeable gap in the exploration of knowledge sharing dynamics within project teams of a temporary nature. Furthermore, while there is extensive literature on trust development among team members, there is a scarcity of research specifically addressing trust development in project teams within PBOs.

The aim of this literature review is to emphasise the significance of trust development in temporary teams, particularly in project-based teams where knowledge sharing is paramount. Notably, there is a need for more research on swift trust, suggesting that team members in temporary settings may establish trust rapidly. Investigating swift trust can offer valuable insights for practitioners, raising awareness of trust development and its significance in fostering knowledge sharing. This, in turn, contributes to advancing the theoretical understanding of knowledge sharing practices. Further research in this area is essential to enhance our understanding of swift trust and its implications for effective knowledge sharing within temporary teams

References

- Adloff, F., Gerund, K. and Kaldewey, D. (2015) *Revealing tacit knowledge: Embodiment and explication*, Germany: Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.
- Ajmal, M. K. and Koskinen, U. K. (2008) 'Knowledge transfer in project-based organisations: An organisational culture perspective', *Project Management Journal*, 39(1), pp. 7-15.
- Al Attar, F. and Shaalan, K. (2016) 'Enablers and barriers of knowledge spiral: A case study,' *Proceedings of the 11th International Knowledge Management Organisation Conference Changing Face Knowledge Management Impacting Society*, 16 July, pp. 52.
- Ali, A. A., Paris, L., and Gunasekaran, A. (2018) 'Key factors influencing knowledge sharing practices and its relationship with organisational performance within the oil and gas industry', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(9), pp. 1806-1837.
- Anwar, R., Rehman, M., Wang, S. K. and Hashmani, M. A. (2019) 'Systematic literature review of knowledge sharing barriers and facilitators in global software development organisations using concept maps', *IEEE Access*, 7, pp. 24231–24247. Available at doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2895690
- Argote, L. and Ingram, P. (2000) 'Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms', *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), pp. 150–169.
- Argyris, C. and Schön, D. A. (1996) *Organisational Learning II Theory, Method, and Practice*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley..
- Argyris, C. (1999) *On organisational learning*, 2nd Edition. Oxford. Blackwell Publishing.
- Asrar-ul-Haq, M. and Anwar, S. (2016) 'A systematic review of knowledge management and knowledge sharing: Trends, issues, and challenges', *Cogent Business & Management*, pp. 1-17.
- Atkinson, R., Crawford, L. and Ward, S. (2006) 'Fundamental uncertainties in projects and the scope of project management', *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, pp. 687–698.

- Azeem, M., Ahmed, M., Haider, S. and Sajjad, M. (2021) 'Expanding competitive advantage through organizational culture, knowledge sharing and organizational innovation', *Technology in Society*, 66, pp. 1-10.
- Barczak, G., Lassk, F. and Mulki, J. (2010) 'Antecedents of team creativity: An examination of team emotional intelligence, team trust and collaborative culture', *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(4), pp. 332-345.
- Berthold, J. (2015) 'Stimulating team creativity: The influence of Swift-trust on the team creativity process', *Journal of Sustainability Management*, 3(1), pp. 19-27.
- Bogilović, S., Černe, M., and Škerlavaj, M. (2017) 'Hiding behind a mask? Cultural intelligence, knowledge hiding, and individual and team creativity', *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 26(5), pp. 710-723.
- Boies, K., Fiset, J. and Gill, H. (2015) 'Communication and trust are key: Unlocking the relationship between leadership and team performance and creativity', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, pp. 1080-1094.
- Buvik, M. P. and Rolfsen, M. (2015) 'Prior ties and trust development in project teams – A case study from the construction industry', *International Journal of Project Management*, 33, pp.1484–1494.
- Carmeli, A., Tishler, A., Dutton, J. E., & Yami, S. (2020) 'Transformational leadership and performance in high-tech firms: The role of trust, social interaction, and knowledge creation', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(9), pp. 2031-2054. Available at DOI: 10.1108/JKM-10-2019-0578.
- Caruso, S. J. (2017) 'A foundation for understanding knowledge sharing: organisational culture, informal workplace learning, performance support, and knowledge management', *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 10(1), pp. 45-52.
- Casimir, G., Lee, K. and Loon, M. (2012) 'Knowledge sharing: influences of trust, commitment and cost', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 165, pp. 740-753.
- Cavaliere, V., Lombardi, S. and Giustiniano, L. (2015) 'Knowledge sharing in knowledge-intensive manufacturing firms. An empirical study of its enablers', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(6), pp. 1124-1145.

- Chen, Y., Lin, Y. and Yen, C., D. (2014) 'How to facilitate inter-organisational knowledge sharing: The impact of trust', *Information & Management*, 51, pp. 568–578.
- Chugh, R. (2015) 'Do Australian universities encourage tacit knowledge transfer?', *7th International Joint Conference on Knowledge Discovery, Knowledge Engineering and Knowledge Management*, Portugal: pp. 128-135.
- Cleveland, S. and Ellis, T. J. (2015) 'Rethinking knowledge sharing barriers: A content analysis of 103 studies', *International Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(1), pp. 28-51.
- Connelly, C., Zweig, D., Webster, J. And Trougakos P. J. (2012) 'Knowledge hiding in organisations', *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 33, pp. 64–88.
- Costa, C. A. (2003) 'Work team trust and effectiveness', *Personnel Review*, 32(5), pp. 605-622.
- Crisp, C. B. and Jarvenpaa, L. S. (2013) 'Swift trust in global virtual teams trusting beliefs and normative actions', *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(1), pp. 45–56.
- Curado, C. and Vieira, S. (2019) 'Trust, knowledge sharing and organisational commitment in SMEs', *Personnel Review*, 48(6), pp. 1449-1468.
- Davenport, T. H. and Prusak, L. (2005) *Working knowledge: How organisations manage what they know*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press
- Dayan, M. and Di Benedetto, C.A. (2010) 'The impact of structural and contextual factors on trust formation in product development teams', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(4), pp. 691–703.
- Desouza, K. (2003) 'Facilitating tacit knowledge exchange', *Communications of the ACM*, 46(6), pp. 85-88.
- Drucker, P. (1993) *Post-capital society*. British publishing company: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Davidavičienė, V., Al Majzoub, K. and Meidute-Kavaliauskiene, I. (2020) 'Factors affecting knowledge sharing in virtual teams', *Sustainability*, 12(17), pp.1-15.

- Geister, S., Konradt, U. and Hertel, G. (2006) 'Effects of process feedback on motivation, satisfaction, and performance in virtual teams', *Small Group Research*, 37(5), pp. 459–489.
- Germain, M.L. (2011) 'Developing trust in virtual teams', *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 24(3), pp. 29–54.
- Grant, R. M. (1996) 'Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm', *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, pp. 109-122.
- Hill., N. S., Bartol, M. K., Tesluk, E. P. and Langa, A. G. (2009) 'Organisational context and face-to-face interaction: influences on the development of trust and collaborative behaviour in computer-mediated groups', *Organisational behaviour and human decision process*, 108(2), pp. 187-201.
- Hobday, M. (2000) 'The project-based organisation: an ideal form for managing complex products and systems?', *Research Policy*, 29, pp. 871-893.
- Hsu, M., Chang, C. and Yen, C. (2011) 'Exploring the antecedents of trust in virtual communities', *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 30(5), pp. 587–601.
- Huber, G. P. (1991) 'Organisational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures', *Organisational Science*, 2(1), pp.88-115.
- Ipe, M. (2003) 'Knowledge sharing in organisations: A conceptual framework', *Human Resource Development Review*, 2(4), pp. 337-359.
- Islam, M.N., Furuoka, F. and Idris, A. (2021) 'Mapping the relationship between transformational leadership, trust in leadership and employee championing behavior during organizational change', *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 26(2), pp. 95-102.
- Jørgensen, L. and Åsgård, T. (2019) 'Trust and control in project management', *Procedia Computer Science*, 164, pp. 397–406.
- Joshi, K.D., Sarker, Saonee and Sarker, Suprateek (2007) 'Knowledge transfer within information systems development teams: Examining the role of knowledge source attributes', *Decision Support Systems*, 43(2), pp. 322–335. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2006.10.003>.

- Jugdev, K. and Wishart, P. (2014) 'Mutual caring-resolving habituation through awareness: supporting meaningful learning from projects', *Project management Journal*, 45(2), pp. 66-82.
- Kipkosgei, F., Son, S. Y., & Kang, S.-W. (2020). Coworker Trust and Knowledge Sharing among Public Sector Employees in Kenya. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(6), 2009. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17062009>
- Kitimbo, I. and Dalkir, K. (2013) 'Characterisation of knowledge sharing practices in a project based organisation', *International Conference on Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Management and Organisational Learning*. Academic Conferences International Limited, Kidmore End.
- Kogut, B. and Zander, U. (1992) 'Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology', *Organisation Science*, 3(3), pp. 383-397.
- Langfred, W. C. (2007) 'The downside of self-management: a longitudinal study of the effects of conflict on trust, autonomy, and task interdependence in self-managing teams', *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4), pp.885-900.
- Lee, P., Gillespie, N., Mann, L. and Wearing, A. (2010) 'Leadership and trust: Their effect on knowledge sharing and team performance', *Management Learning*, 41(4), pp. 473–491.
- Legood, A., van der Werff, L., Lee, A. and Den Hartog, D. (2020) 'A meta-analysis of the role of trust in the leadership performance relationship', *European Journal of Work and Organisation Psychology* . 30, pp.1–22.
- Lewicki, R. J. and Bunker, B. B. (1996) Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer & T. M. Tyler (eds.), *Trust in organisations: Frontiers of theory and research*. California: Sage, pp. 114-139.
- Lewicki, J. R., McAllister, J. D. and Bies, R. J. (1998) 'Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities', *Academy of Management Review*. 23(3), pp. 438-458.
- Ma, Z., Qi, L. and Wang, K. (2008) 'Knowledge sharing in Chinese construction project teams and its affecting factors', *Chinese Management Studies*, 2(2), pp. 97-108.

- Mach, M., Dolan, S. and Tzafrir, S. (2010) 'The differential effect of team members' trust on team performance: The mediation role of team cohesion', *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 83, pp. 771–794.
- Maravilhas, S. and Martins, J. (2019) 'Strategic knowledge management in a digital environment: Tacit and explicit knowledge in Fab Labs', *Journal of Business Research*, 94, pp. 353-359.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. and Schoorman, D. F. (1995) 'An integrative model of organisational trust', *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), pp. 709-734.
- McAllister, J. D. (1995) 'Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organisations', *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), pp. 24-59.
- McDermott, R. (1999) 'Why information technology inspired but cannot deliver knowledge management', *California Management Review*, 41(4).
- McLaren, M. and Loosemore, M. (2019) 'Swift trust formation in multi-national disaster project management teams', *International Journal of Project Management*, 37(8), pp. 979-988.
- Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E., & Kramer, R. M. (1996) Swift trust and temporary groups. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organisations: Frontiers of theory and research*. California: Sage, pp. 166-195.
- Mishra, B. and, Bhaskar, U. A. (2011) 'Knowledge management process in two learning organisations', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(2), pp. 344-359.
- Mueller, J. (2014) 'A specific knowledge culture: Cultural antecedents for knowledge sharing between project teams', *European Management Journal*, 32(2) pp. 190-202.
- Muqadas, F., Ilyas, M., Aslam, U. and Ur Rehman, U. (2016) 'Antecedents of knowledge sharing and its impact on employees' creativity and work performance', *Pakistan Business Review*, 18(3), pp. 655-674.
- Naber, A., Payne, C. S. and Webber, S. (2018) 'The relative influence of trustor and trustee individual differences on peer assessments of trust', *Personality and Individual Differences*, 128, pp. 62-68.

- Nonaka, I. (1994) 'A dynamic theory of organisational knowledge creation', *Organisational Science*, 5(1), pp. 14-37.
- Olaisen, J. and Revang, O. (2017) 'Working smarter and greener: Collaborative knowledge sharing in virtual global project teams', *International Journal of Information Management*, 37, pp. 1441-1448.
- Ouakouak, L., M. and Ouedraogo, N. (2018) 'Fostering knowledge sharing and knowledge utilisation: The impact of organisational commitment and trust', *Business Process Management Journal*, 25(4), pp. 757-779.
- Park, J. and Lee, J. (2014) 'Knowledge sharing in information systems development projects: Explicating the role of dependence and trust', *International Journal of Project Management*, 32(1), pp. 153–165.
- Park, S. and Kim, E. (2015) 'Revisiting knowledge sharing from the organisational change perspective', *European Journal of Training and Development*, 39(9) pp. 769-797.
- Phung, V.D., Hawryszkiewicz, I. and Chandran, D. (2019) 'How knowledge sharing leads to innovative work behaviour: A moderating role of transformational leadership', *Journal of Systems and Information Technology*, 21(3), pp. 277-303.
- Pinjani, P, and Palvia, P. (2013) 'Trust and knowledge sharing in diverse global virtual teams', *Information & Management*, 50(4), pp. 144-153.
- Polanyi, M. (1966) 'The logic of tacit inference', *The Journal of the Royal Institute of Philosophy*, 41(155), pp. 1-18.
- Project Management Institute (2017) '*A guide to the project management body of knowledge (PMBOK guide)*', Pennsylvania: Project Management Institute.
- Qureshi, A., M., H. and Evans, N. (2015) 'Deterrents to knowledge-sharing in the pharmaceutical industry: a case study', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(2), pp. 296-314.
- Rahmi, D., Y. and Indarti, N. (2019) 'Examining the relationships among cognitive diversity, knowledge sharing and team climate in team innovation', *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, 25(5), pp. 299-31.

- Renzl, B. (2006) 'Trust in management and knowledge sharing: The mediating effects of fear and knowledge documentation', *Omega*, 36(2) pp. 206 – 220.
- Rios-Ballesteros, N. and Fuerst, S. (2022) 'Exploring the enablers and microfoundations of international knowledge transfer', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(7), pp.1868-1898.
- Robert P. L., Dennis, R. A. and Hung, C. Y. (2009) 'Individual swift trust and knowledge-based trust in face-to-face and virtual team members', *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 26(2), pp. 241-279.
- Rosendaal, B. and Bijlsma-Frankema, K. (2015) 'Knowledge sharing within teams: enabling and constraining factors', *Knowledge management research and practice*,13(3), pp. 1-13.
- Rutten, W., Blaas-Franken, J. and Martin, H. (2016) 'The impact of (low) trust on knowledge sharing', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 20(2), pp. 199-21.
- Schindler, M. and Eppler, J. M. (2003) 'Harvesting project knowledge: a review of project learning methods and success factors', *International Journal of Project Management* 21(3), pp. 219-228.
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, C. R. and Davis H. J. (2007) 'An integrative model of organizational trust: past, present, and future', *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), pp. 344–354.
- Senge, P. (2006) *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. London: Random House Business Books.
- Sheng, W. and Noe, A. R. (2010) 'Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research', *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, pp. 115–131.
- Srivastava, A., Bartol M. K. and Locke A. E. (2006) 'Empowering leadership in management teams: effects on knowledge sharing, efficiency and performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(6), pp. 1239-1251.
- Swart, J., Kinnie, N., van Rossenberg, Y., and Yalabik, Y. Z. (2014) 'Why should I share my knowledge? A multiple foci of commitment perspective', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), pp. 269–289.

- Swift, P. and Hwang, A. (2013) 'The impact of affective and cognitive trust on knowledge sharing and organisational learning', *The Learning Organisation*, 20(1), pp. 20-37.
- Sydow, J., Lindkvist, L. and DeFillippi, R. (2004) 'Project-based organisations, embeddedness and repositories of knowledge: editorial', *Organisation Studies*, 25(9), pp. 1475–1489.
- Tenzer, H., Pudelko, M. and Harzing A. (2014) 'The impact of language barriers on trust formation in multinational teams', *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(5) pp. 508–535.
- Terzieva, M., (2014) 'Project knowledge management: How organisations learn from experience', *Procedia Technology*, 16, pp. 1086–1095.
- Teece, D., Peteraf, M.A. and Heaton, S. (2016) '*Dynamic Capabilities and Organizational Agility: Risk, Uncertainty and Entrepreneurial Management in the Innovation Economy*'. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2771245>.
- Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K. and Nonaka, I. (2000) *Enabling knowledge creation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walther, B. J. and Bunz, U. (2005) 'The rules of virtual groups: Trust, liking and performance in computer-mediated communication', *Journal of Communication*, 55(4), pp. 847-863.
- Wang, S., Noe, R.A. and Wang, Z.-M. (2014) 'Motivating knowledge sharing in knowledge management systems a quasi-field experiment', *Journal of Management*, 40(4), pp. 978-1009.
- Wei, Y. and Miraglia, S. (2017) 'Organisational culture and knowledge transfer in project-based organisations: Theoretical insights from a Chinese construction firm', *International Journal of Project Management*, 35(4), pp. 571-585.
- Wickramasinghe, V. and Widyaratne, R. (2012) 'Effects of interpersonal trust, team leader support, rewards, and knowledge sharing mechanisms on knowledge sharing in project teams', *The Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 42(2), pp. 214-236.

- Wittenbaum, M. G., Hollingshead, B. A. and Botero, C. I. (2004) 'From cooperative to motivated information sharing in groups: moving beyond the hidden profile paradigm', *Communication Monographs*, 71(3), pp. 286–310.
- Wu, D., Liao, Z. and Dai, J. (2015) 'Knowledge heterogeneity and team knowledge sharing as moderated by internal social capital', *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 43(3), pp. 423-436.
- Xue, Y., Bradley, J. and Liang, H. (2011) 'Team climate, empowering leadership, and knowledge sharing', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(2), pp. 299-312.
- Yeşil, S. and Hatunoğlu, M. (2019) 'Knowledge Sharing Attitude: An Exploratory Study among University Students', *Journal of International Cooperation and Development*, 2(2), p. 36. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jicd-2019-0011>
- Zakaria, N. and Mohd Yusof, S.A. (2020) 'Crossing Cultural Boundaries Using the Internet: Toward Building a Model of Swift Trust Formation in Global Virtual Teams', *Journal of International Management*, 26(1), p. 100654.
- Zand, E. D. (1971) 'Trust and managerial problem solving', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), pp. 229-239.
- Zboralski, K. (2009) 'Antecedents of knowledge sharing in communities of practice', *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 13(3), pp. 90-101.
- Zeb, A., Abdullah, N. H., Hussain, A. and Safi, A. (2019) 'Authentic leadership, knowledge sharing, and employees' creativity', *Management Research Review*, 43(6), pp. 669-690.