



Reaping Benefits from Knowledge Transfer – The Role of Confidence in Knowledge

Journal:	<i>Journal of Knowledge Management</i>
Manuscript ID	JKM-04-2020-0262.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Knowledge management, Knowledge Transfer

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Reaping Benefits from Knowledge Transfer – The Role of Confidence in Knowledge

Abstract

Purpose

This paper seeks to develop a conceptual model that examines the role of individual's confidence in the transferred knowledge in realizing benefits from such transfers. In so doing, the paper attempts to address the gap in the KT literature pertaining to the inability of recipients to gain benefits from incoming transferred knowledge.

Design/methodology/approach

The conceptual model has been developed by drawing from the literature on socio-cognitive approaches by employing psychological variables (individual level differences in need for closure, regulatory focus, and self-efficacy) and contextual factors including perceived novelty of knowledge and positive feedback from social interactions affecting confidence in incoming knowledge.

Findings

The conceptual model builds on the socio-cognitive perspective and explores some of the important issues that could contribute to the individual's adeptness (or lack thereof) in deriving benefits from transferred knowledge thus addressing a vital gap in strategy and management literature.

Originality/value

The paper introduces the concept of confidence in knowledge to the KT literature, which could lend valuable insights pertaining to deriving benefits from transferred knowledge. In addition, by highlighting the role of important individual specific constructs in determining the ability

1
2
3 to gain benefits from KT, the paper makes a significant contribution to the stream of research
4
5 on the micro-foundational bases of strategy. Finally, exploring perceived novelty as a
6
7 knowledge attribute in this paper adds an interesting perspective to the individuals' perception
8
9 of the target knowledge quality and the resulting confidence in the incoming knowledge, which
10
11 could in turn be moderated by individual differences.
12
13

14
15 **Keywords:** knowledge transfer, confidence, motivated cognition, novelty, socio-cognitive
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reaping Benefits from Knowledge Transfer – The Role of Confidence in Knowledge

Introduction

In the modern knowledge-based economy, firms attribute considerable importance to knowledge transfer that enables them to tap into the competencies and resources dispersed globally (Almeida, Song, and Grant, 2002; Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1989). Not surprisingly, in order to develop competitive advantage, firms often encourage their employees to engage with knowledge transfers with other organisational units that could prove to be beneficial for organizations in terms of solving problems, improving productivity and efficiency, and creating innovative products/services. For this, transferred knowledge needs to result in benefits for the firm, which is possible only if further action is taken on this incoming knowledge. When potentially beneficial knowledge is transferred, the initial recognition, interpretation and assessment of this knowledge happens at the individual level (Argote and Ingram, 2000; Crossan, Lane, and White, 1999; Daft and Weick, 1984). An individual could accept or reject this new and useful knowledge, which in turn determines the possibility of further action being taken on this knowledge. Thus, it is important to understand the individual level factors that could affect the possibility of deriving benefits from incoming transferred knowledge.

Firms often initiate knowledge transfers between their organisational units so that other organisational units can tap into the same and reap benefits for them. However, it is unlikely that all individuals or employees engage or interact with this knowledge in ways to transform this to something that could be beneficial to the firm. There could be several reasons for individuals to accept or reject the potentially beneficial new incoming knowledge. This could be because of the individual's perceptions of the incoming knowledge that are linked to

1
2
3 consistency with his/her belief system, relevance and benefit to the context, and disturbing the
4 status-quo (Eidelman, Crandall, and Pattershall, 2009). Such perceptions are the outcomes of
5 cognitive filtering that affect the evaluation process and subsequently results in a certain level
6 of confidence associated with taking further action on this knowledge (Daft and Weick, 1984).
7
8 Based on their socio-cognitive schema, some individuals may be quick to discard potentially
9 useful knowledge, while there could be others who are keener to accept and process this new
10 knowledge. For example, an employee may not engage in a deeper analysis of the useful
11 incoming knowledge or find alternatives to use it. This may be because the individual perceives
12 challenges in this process, and might not want to disturb his/her current status-quo by taking
13 up this challenge or the individual is not sure if he/she will emerge successful in this challenge.
14 So the easier way for such individuals is to discount the incoming knowledge (despite its
15 usefulness), and their socio-cognitive schema contributes to this. Knowledge is related to action
16 (Hawthorne and Stanley, 2008). Hence, the benefits from the transferred knowledge can be
17 realized only when further action is taken on the same.
18
19

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Thus, for the transferred knowledge to be put into action, individuals need to have confidence in this incoming knowledge (Pillai and Goldsmith, 2006), which in turn will help realize benefits from the same. Specific to the context of this analysis, confidence can be defined as the strength of belief within the individual that the incoming knowledge has the potential to yield benefits for the organisation. Confidence and its effects on decision-making are aspects that have attracted the attention of a variety of scholars including psychologists and philosophers (Fischhoff, Slovic, and Lichtenstein, 1977; Yates, Lee, and Bush, 1997). Confidence arises following the individual's interpretation and assessment of the incoming knowledge. Given the documented effects of confidence on decision-making, it can have a direct effect on the individual's decision to employ or reject the incoming knowledge in a knowledge transfer context.

1
2
3 Following from the above discussions, it is evident that the concept of confidence in
4 incoming knowledge offers potential new insights in the domain of knowledge transfer.
5
6 Scholars (Argote and Ingram, 2000; Becker-Ritterspach, 2006; Ringberg and Reihlen, 2008)
7
8 have often pointed out that little is known about what happens to the knowledge (in the
9 receiving context) resulting from knowledge transfer (KT), especially when it comes to the role
10
11 of individual actors who first detect this incoming knowledge, assess it and take it forward.
12
13 This lack of focus on micro-level mechanisms has been largely attributed to the unit of analysis,
14
15 which is often at the firm level (Felin and Foss, 2015; Foss and Pederson, 2004). This is true
16
17 with respect to the vast majority of the extant KT literature as well (Ambos and Ambos, 2009;
18
19 Dhanaraj et al., 2004; Gupta and Govindarajan, 2000; Lind and Kang, 2017). Although
20
21 confidence as a concept has been widely used in psychology and decision theory (Alba and
22
23 Hutchinson, 2000; Yates et al., 1997), it has not been utilized in the KT literature, in spite of
24
25 the significant role it can play to influence the individual's decision to engage further with the
26
27 incoming knowledge. This paper seeks to address this gap.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 The paper builds on the socio-cognitive approaches (Garud and Rappa, 1994; Ringberg
36
37 and Reihlen, 2008) in identifying psychological variables that are at the interface of motivation
38
39 and cognition (De Grada *et al.*, 1999; Jost *et al.*, 2003), as factors affecting confidence in
40
41 incoming knowledge. The individual level variables linked to motivated cognition that have
42
43 been employed in this paper are need for closure, regulatory focus, and self-efficacy. The
44
45 effects of motivated cognition on the confidence of individuals have been seldom investigated
46
47 in KT literature, which this paper attempts to address.
48
49
50

51
52 Socio-cognitive approaches also highlight the influence of context and how individuals
53
54 make sense of new knowledge (Ringberg and Reihlen, 2008) based on their social interactions.
55
56 The kind of feedback they receive from these social interactions are likely to influence the
57
58 individual's confidence in the incoming knowledge. The knowledge context is equally relevant
59
60

1
2
3 in terms of its attributes such as its perceived novelty as it is can either boost (in anticipation
4 of the perceived benefits) or stifle (due to the limitations in cognitive capabilities) the
5 recipient's confidence in the incoming knowledge (Grant, 1996; Smith, 2016). Thus the link
6 between individual's confidence and perceived novelty of target knowledge is very significant
7 to deriving benefits from this incoming knowledge. Hence, this paper explores the influences
8 of positive feedback from social interactions and perceived novelty on individual's confidence
9 in incoming knowledge.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 The paper makes four important contributions to the literature. First, the model builds on
20 the socio-cognitive perspective and explores some of the important issues that could contribute
21 to the individual's adeptness (or lack thereof) in deriving benefits from transferred knowledge
22 thus addressing a vital gap in strategy and management literature. Second, by highlighting the
23 role of important individual specific constructs in determining the ability to gain benefits from
24 KT, the paper makes a significant contribution to the stream of research on the micro-
25 foundational bases of strategy. Third, the paper introduces the concept of confidence in
26 knowledge to the KT literature, which could lend valuable insights pertaining to deriving
27 benefits from transferred knowledge. Finally, exploring perceived novelty as a knowledge
28 attribute in this paper adds an interesting perspective to the individuals' perception of the target
29 knowledge quality and the resulting confidence in the incoming knowledge, which could in
30 turn be moderated by individual differences.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Theoretical Background**

49
50 Prior research on the extent of KT (Ambos, Ambos, and Schlegelmilch, 2006; Dhanaraj *et al.*,
51 2004; Gupta and Govindarajan, 2000; Morgulis-Yakusheva, Yildiz, and Fey, 2018; Yang,
52 Mudambi, and Meyer, 2008) and on benefits, effectiveness and efficiency of KT (Ambos and
53 Ambos, 2009; Lind and Kang, 2017; Nair *et al.*, 2018; Szulanski, Capetta, and Jensen, 2004)
54 has been firm-level studies that mostly focus on organizational characteristics and mechanisms
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as the main antecedents. These include antecedents like absorptive capacity, communication
4 and socialization mechanisms, learning environment, autonomy & control, knowledge
5 attributes, and reward mechanisms to name a few (cf. Michailova and Mustaffa, 2012; Zeng,
6 Grøgaard, and Steel, 2018). Some studies also focus on the relationship between the involved
7 firms or unit, emphasising the role of social capital (Khan, Lew, and Sinkovics, 2015;
8 Muthuswamy and White, 2005; Parra-Requena *et al.*, 2015). Socio-cultural linkages could also
9 play a vital role in knowledge transfers (Sarala *et al.*, 2016). Studies have also looked at the
10 role of boundary spanners and expatriates in KT (Reiche, 2011; Wang *et al.*, 2009).

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 The extant literature has explored several aspects that could influence KT, which include
23 factors like absorptive capacity, organisational resources, expertise, communication and
24 integrative mechanisms, motivational mechanisms, structure, and networks (Chen, 2004; Goh,
25 2002; Guechtouli, Rouchier and Orillard, 2013; Gupta and Govindarajan, 2000; Reagans and
26 McEvily, 2003; Sié and Yakhlef, 2009; Tasi, 2001; Yang, Mudambi, and Meyer, 2008).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Against this background, this paper seeks to probe the lesser explored and vital role of
individuals as decision makers, who are evaluating, interpreting and engaging further with this
incoming transferred knowledge. It seeks to examine in depth as to why certain individuals are
more likely to gain confidence in the incoming knowledge than others and subsequently gain
benefits from this potentially useful transferred knowledge. Note that the focus is on potentially
useful knowledge that is transferred from other organisational units in the firm. Thus, the
transferred unsuitable or obsolete knowledge as possible reasons for the lack of benefits is not
really the focus of this study. Rather, it explores the factors that lead to the effective use or
otherwise of transferred knowledge from other organisational units that has potential utility to
the recipient. Such knowledge transfers are mostly planned and initiated by the firm (deliberate
attempts) to other units within the organisation since they foresee potential benefits from the
same. To further delimit the focus of the paper, only the transferred explicit (procedural and

1
2
3 declarative) knowledge has been considered. Since the transferred knowledge comprises
4
5 mainly codified information, we adopt a reductionist view of knowledge for the purpose of the
6
7 present analysis. Further research can extend the analysis to the study of transferred tacit
8
9 knowledge. Thus, this paper explores the critical role of confidence in transferred knowledge
10
11 and the antecedent effects of individual specific and contextual factors that could lead to
12
13 confidence in the transferred incoming knowledge.
14
15

16
17 In so doing, the paper contributes to the investigation of micro-foundations of
18
19 organisational capabilities. In most of the above-mentioned studies, individual level factors
20
21 have received little or no attention. Moreover, scholars have been increasingly questioning this
22
23 disembodied concept of knowledge (Garud and Rappa, 1994; Ringberg and Reihlen, 2008),
24
25 which has paved the way for a socio-cognitive perspective that views knowledge as
26
27 endogenous to the human mind, thus reinforcing the call for more studies that investigate the
28
29 micro-foundations of organizational capabilities (Felin and Foss, 2015). This paper addresses
30
31 the call.
32
33

34 35 36 *Socio-Cognitive perspective*

37
38 The socio-cognitive perspective is an approach to understanding human social behaviour,
39
40 which involves mental processes of individuals while interacting with others in their
41
42 environment (Martin and Clark, 1990). As per this perspective, KT can be viewed as the
43
44 interplay of cognitive and contextual factors, which is an interpretive process (Reihlen and
45
46 Ringberg, 2013; Ringberg and Reihlen, 2008). According to the socio-cognitive view, both
47
48 private and shared mental models are involved in the processing of incoming knowledge.
49
50

51
52 Social Cognitive Theory (SCT), which belongs to this stream of literature, focuses on
53
54 human behavior linked to cognition and personality as well as contextual influences (Bandura,
55
56 1986). As per this theory, human motivation and action is self-regulated by forethought
57
58 (anticipatory system), which means that individuals anticipate certain outcomes as a result of
59
60

1
2
3 their actions. These outcomes then motivate as well as regulate their choices, strategies,
4 behavior, actions etc. SCT focuses on two types of cognition (Fiske, 1992; Kruglanski, 1990)
5 - pure social cognition as well as motivated cognition (interface of cognition and motivation,
6 also known as cognitively generated motivation). Motivated cognition refers to the links
7 between individual's beliefs and his/her motivational underpinnings (Higgins, 1998;
8 Kruglanski, 1996). Motivated cognition focusses on the role of cognition in regulating
9
10 behaviours and actions taking into consideration the interaction effects (social context) and
11 goes with the notion that "thinking is for doing" (De Grada *et al.*, 1999), which is very
12 important in the context of deriving benefits from KT.
13
14

15 Most of human motivation is cognitively generated (Bandura, 1993). Thus, individuals
16 motivate themselves by anticipating likely outcomes for their actions or behavior. Here there
17 is a self-regulation of motivation (also referred to as self-regulatory cognition) and self-efficacy
18 plays a key role in this self-regulation (Bandura, 1991). It is an integral element of SCT.
19 Individuals with high self-efficacy have a strong belief that they are capable of successfully
20 performing a certain action in order to attain a certain desired outcome. They attribute lack of
21 effort to failures. This belief they have in their capabilities can influence the choices they make,
22 the effort they put in and how they persevere in challenging situations (Bandura, 1991). Thus,
23 self-efficacy has the ability (cognition that can generate motivation) to influence action and is
24 directly linked to behavior as it affects one's confidence to engage with a certain task. An
25 example of this would be employees with high self-efficacy setting more challenging goals for
26 themselves (like applying knowledge transferred to solve problems or find new solutions), and
27 then focus their entire effort towards this, not relenting when faced with obstacles or difficulty
28 and hence are also likely to be more confident that they will achieve what they set out to do.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 As discussed earlier, self-regulation is a vital aspect of SCT. Individuals engage in self-
56 regulation by aligning themselves (their behavior, thought and action) to appropriate goals or
57
58
59
60

standards (Higgins and Spiegel, 2004). Regulatory focus is a construct (linked to cognition) which taps into two self-regulatory mechanisms in individuals, namely promotion focus and prevention focus (Higgins, 1997). Individuals with a promotion focus are driven by the need to achieve growth and accomplishment. Hence, they eagerly pursue their goals and seek pleasure via positive outcomes. Individuals with a prevention focus are driven by the concern for stability, safety and caution. They try to minimize negative outcomes. Hence, when engaged in a task, the individuals with promotion focus are more likely to generate more distinct alternatives when compared to individuals with prevention focus (Crowe and Higgins, 1997). This is a construct which influences individual's motivation that is relevant to goal accomplishment and hence can affect individual's strategic inclinations and tactical preferences (Higgins, 1998). It also has been found to have an effect on judgmental processes, and initiating goal related action (Higgins and Spiegel, 2004). Thus, promotion-focused individuals are found to be more optimistic and exude more confidence when compared to prevention-focused individuals, who are more pessimistic (Brockner, Higgins and Low, 2004). For example, promotion focussed employees would have a very positive outlook towards work and are looking for ways to learn, grow and boost their achievements to derive pleasure from these positive outcomes. They are quick to embrace changes as they are open to new possibilities and do not hesitate to take risks to accomplish their goals and hence are more likely to engage with the knowledge transferred in novel ways and derive the required confidence to use it for the benefit of the organisation.

Need for closure (NFC) is the need for individuals to attain an immediate decision on an issue (seize – urgency tendency) and to stick to a particular decision (freeze – permanence tendency) without considering alternatives (Webster and Kruglanski, 1994). Individuals with a high NFC tend to prefer consensual knowledge (De Grada *et al.*, 1999). This is motivated cognition which is linked to decision making (Roets and van Hiel, 2011). Hence, NFC is the

1
2
3 motivated tendency to seek structure, simplicity and avoiding complexity or ambiguity
4 (Kruglanski, 1990). This is found to affect problem solving and seeking alternatives (Webster
5 and Kruglanski, 1994) and is closely linked to information seeking and confidence (Kruglanski,
6 Peri and Zakai, 1991). Hence, NFC, a motivated cognition construct, also comes under the
7 realm of SCT and has an influence on individual's decisions, as well as his/her actions and
8 behavior. As an example, an employee with a high NFC, is very likely to struggle when faced
9 with a challenging task (which may not yield an answer immediately). Hence, such individuals
10 may not seek all alternatives (while engaging with transferred knowledge), and may prefer to
11 either fall back on something that he/she is already familiar with (quick decisions, but may not
12 be the best) or something that is readily available. They may also be reluctant to change their
13 stance on this new knowledge or process this knowledge, even in the light of new persuasive
14 insights that may emerge. Thus, they may also quickly form impressions and be quick to
15 discard the knowledge as well.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 ***The role of the individual***

35
36 For individuals engaged with the incoming knowledge during a KT, the initial task is to make
37 sense of this knowledge. Individuals make sense of new knowledge by attempting to justify
38 this knowledge and interpreting it (Crossan *et al.*, 1999; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). The
39 individuals' cognitive framework, expertise, and experience can influence this process. The
40 incoming knowledge would be filtered through cognitive and normative interpretations of
41 individuals within the organization (Inkpen and Dinur, 1998; Regner and Zander, 2011) which
42 will eventually determine the individual's confidence in this knowledge as depicted in figure
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 1.

54
55 -----
56
57 Insert Figure 1 here
58
59 -----
60

1
2
3 According to the theory of reasoned action, individuals' beliefs pertaining to a domain
4 determine their perceptions, behaviour, and the choices they make within the domain (Ajzen
5 and Fishbein 1980). As per the socio-cognitive view, the individual's beliefs and perceptions
6 about knowledge are very closely intertwined with their contexts, their interactions with this
7 context and the shared identities they have formed in the organizational context (Bandura,
8 1986). The social interactions that they have with peers and other colleagues within their
9 network can provide the required feedback and external validation that individuals often seek
10 while encountering new knowledge (Simonet *et al.*, 2015; Tsai, 2001). All these can potentially
11 influence individual's private mental models (Jonsson and Regner, 2009) and can thus
12 influence the individual's confidence in the incoming knowledge and the further processing of
13 this knowledge.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 ***Confidence in the incoming knowledge***

31 Confidence is defined as the strength of belief within the individual that the incoming
32 knowledge has the potential to yield benefits and hence is worthy of further processing.
33 Confidence is linked to individual's socio-cognitive processes and is important because it
34 affects the further course of action (Sniezek, 1992). Individual's anticipatory proactive system
35 plays a vital role, as cognitively generated motivation, which enables individuals to engage
36 with meaningful cognitive processing and choice of appropriate cognitive strategies that could
37 generate the required confidence in knowledge (DeBacker and Crowson, 2006; 2009;
38 Morandin and Bergami, 2014). Confidence will also be influenced by social aspects such as
39 opinions and beliefs of others, through shared sense-making processes (Gioia and Sims, 1986;
40 Maitlis and Christianson, 2014). Social information processing theorists (e.g., Boekhorst, 2015;
41 Salancik and Pfeffer, 1978) have demonstrated how this transmission of beliefs takes place.
42 Following this stream of research, we reason that confidence generation in individuals, in the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context of KT, is essentially a socio-cognitive process, underscoring the relevance and validity
4
5 of the current enquiry.
6

7
8 Individuals differ in terms of their confidence related to knowledge and information, with
9
10 some individuals holding a certain piece of knowledge with a high degree of confidence,
11
12 whereas others hold the same with much less confidence. In the psychological literature,
13
14 confidence in knowledge refers to the strength of belief in the veracity of the knowledge held
15
16 (Alba and Hutchinson, 2000). For this study, as noted earlier, confidence can be defined as the
17
18 strength of belief within the individual that the incoming knowledge has the potential to yield
19
20 benefits and hence is worthy of further processing. When there is high confidence, the subject
21
22 has a stronger belief (greater certainty) that the transferred knowledge will yield benefits.
23
24 Conversely, when there is low confidence, the subject has doubts whether the transferred
25
26 knowledge will yield benefits. The study of confidence in knowledge, which we seek to
27
28 introduce to the context of KT, has its roots in psychological research on calibration of
29
30 knowledge and beliefs (Fischhoff, Slovic, and Lichtenstein, 1977).
31
32
33
34

35
36 As noted earlier, the focus in this paper is on knowledge that has potential utility, which
37
38 therefore demands high confidence. When there is high confidence in such useful knowledge,
39
40 it leads to appropriate actions such as optimal decisions. When there is low confidence, we
41
42 have the situation of underconfidence (low confidence in a situation where there should be high
43
44 confidence), which leads to redundant information search and missed opportunities. Following
45
46 from the earlier discussion, underconfidence can arise as a result of socio-cognitive processes
47
48 that generates doubts in managers' minds regarding the utility of the knowledge received.
49
50 Therefore, generating appropriate levels of confidence is critical to deriving benefits from the
51
52 useful transferred knowledge.
53
54
55

56
57 Following from the above discussions, individual's cognitive framework, specifically
58
59 linked to cognitive motivation influences his/her confidence in the incoming knowledge.
60

1
2
3 However, unfamiliarity pertaining to knowledge (leading to lack of confidence in knowledge)
4
5 also arises from the perceived novelty of knowledge, which could potentially make it more
6
7 difficult to comprehend and interpret it and thus raises the risk of handling such knowledge
8
9 (Witt, 2009). The interaction of the individual with the context in terms of his/her social
10
11 interactions could also influence the way this incoming knowledge is interpreted and evaluated.
12
13 This occurs mainly through the feedback emerging from the social interactions and the
14
15 normative interpretations or perceptions that arise from the shared identities that individuals
16
17 share in the organization (Levin and Cross, 2004; Simonet *et al.*, 2015). These feedback and
18
19 perceptions that are contributed by the context play a vital role in validating individual's
20
21 perception of the knowledge and the confidence in the knowledge regarding its potential
22
23 benefits.
24
25
26
27

28 **Propositions for the model**

29
30
31 In this section, we develop propositions for each of the paths as shown in the model in figure
32
33
34 2. We start with the individual specific variables.
35

36 -----
37
38 Insert Figure. 2 here
39
40 -----
41
42

43 ***Confidence***

44
45
46 Confidence in knowledge is a concept that has attracted much attention from scholars in
47
48 psychology and decision theory (Alba and Hutchinson, 2000; Yates *et al.*, 1997, Pillai, 2010).
49
50 Since knowledge is about action (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995), and appropriate confidence in
51
52 knowledge is a prerequisite for right decisions (Alba and Hutchinson, 2000), this is a very
53
54 useful concept. Studies have shown that significant proportions of people could be
55
56 underconfident in their knowledge and perceptions (Bjorkman, Juslin, and Winman, 1993;
57
58 Erev, Wallsten, and Budescu, 1994; Subbotin, 1996). This is especially relevant to the present
59
60

1
2
3 study, where the novelty of the incoming knowledge and its unfamiliarity can diminish the
4
5 confidence in the usefulness of this incoming knowledge. Therefore, we reason that individual
6
7 recipients could -be underconfident in the incoming knowledge.
8

9
10 In a KT context, when the confidence associated with the incoming knowledge is *low*,
11
12 individuals do not act upon the knowledge that they possess, leading to missed opportunities.
13
14 On the other hand, when the confidence is *high*, individuals process this knowledge further (act
15
16 on the knowledge), which in turn leads to realization of benefits from such knowledge. This is
17
18 based on the premise that benefits can be achieved from incoming knowledge, when it is
19
20 deemed actionable and is potentially put to use to achieve some end (Nonaka and Takeuchi,
21
22 1995). In the context of KT, if the individual has a higher level of confidence that they can
23
24 potentially work with this knowledge to yield benefits from this knowledge, then he/she is more
25
26 likely to act on this knowledge to derive the projected benefits.
27
28

29
30 *Proposition 1: Greater the level of confidence the individual has in the incoming*
31
32 *knowledge, greater the benefits derived from the knowledge.*
33
34

35 36 ***Need for closure***

37
38 Need for closure refers to an individual's "desire for a firm answer to a question, any firm
39
40 answer as compared to confusion and/or ambiguity" (Kruglanski 2004, p. 6). Individuals with
41
42 a strong need for closure experience a desire to achieve a sense of closure and maintain this
43
44 (Kruglanski, Pierro, Mannetti, and De Grada, 2006). Thus, this socio-cognitive construct taps
45
46 into the motivated tendencies (Livi *et al.*, 2015) that prefer structure, predictability,
47
48 decisiveness, discomfort with ambiguity, and close-mindedness (Webster and Kruglanski,
49
50 1994). Need for closure is considered one of the vital motivational aspects that affect the
51
52 cognitive-generation process (DeBacker and Crowson, 2006). Cognitive-generation is a
53
54 process wherein knowledge is evaluated prior to being abandoned or accepted, which is very
55
56 relevant in this context for individuals engaged in assessing the incoming knowledge since this
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 affects the confidence they have in this knowledge. The assessment and interpretation of the
4 incoming knowledge, which happens at the individual level, is to a large extent responsible in
5 generating the required confidence to act on this knowledge. However, for individuals to
6 engage effectively in this assessment and interpretation, they need to have favourable cognitive
7 and motivational dispositions that aids them in this process.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15 Individuals *high in need for closure* often tend to frame questions in more abstract terms
16 (Rubini and Kruglanski, 1997). They are also likely to engage in less systematic processing of
17 information (DeDreu, Koole, and Oldersma, 1999; Kruglanski *et al.*, 2006). Hence, individuals
18 who have a *low need for closure* are more motivated to have more meaningful cognitive
19 engagements with the incoming knowledge (leading to better assessment and interpretation of
20 this knowledge) than those with high need for closure, who are likely to resort to more shallow
21 cognitive engagements (DeBacker and Crowson, 2006). All these results point to the marked
22 preference of high need for closure individuals for a stable, ordered world. As Kruglanski
23 (2004) note, the construct facilitates the formation of crystallized knowledge. Not surprisingly,
24 need for closure has been shown to be correlated with intolerance of ambiguity (Frenkel-
25 Brunswick, 1949).

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

The incoming knowledge, which is new to the individual's context (as recipient), will create a certain amount of unfamiliarity as to its potential utility. In this context, individual recipients who have *high need for closure* are likely to not engage in deep processing and search for answers and potential alternatives that are required to make sense of the new knowledge in its context and come up with novel ways to employ the knowledge. They are also likely to discount the incoming knowledge (without adequate assessment or interpretation) as it has the potential to disrupt the stability of their world. In addition, they are less likely to tolerate the ambiguity related to the new incoming knowledge and its further processing. Individuals with *low need for closure*, on the other hand, will engage in deep processing of this

1
2
3 incoming knowledge and strive to make sense of the new knowledge and derive confidence
4
5 from the same.
6

7
8 *Proposition 2: The lower an individual's need for closure, the greater the confidence in*
9
10 *transferred knowledge.*
11

12 13 **Self-efficacy**

14
15 Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as a person's judgements of his/her capabilities to
16
17 organize and execute the courses of action to attain specific designated goals. The construct is
18
19 an important component in social cognitive theory. Bandura (1977) identified three dimensions
20
21 of self-efficacy - magnitude, generality, and strength. Magnitude refers to individual's efficacy
22
23 expectations regarding tasks that are simple, moderately difficult, and very difficult. Generality
24
25 refers to the domain generality of individual's self-efficacy beliefs-whether the self-efficacy
26
27 beliefs extend beyond the specific domain to other related and even unrelated domains.
28
29 Strength refers to the confidence with which efficacy beliefs are held. Weak self-efficacy
30
31 beliefs are easily affected by disconfirming experiences, whereas strong efficacy beliefs are
32
33 not.
34
35
36
37

38
39 People form self-efficacy beliefs through vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion,
40
41 performance accomplishments, and physiological states (Bandura, 1977). Self-efficacious
42
43 managers are therefore more adept in modelling vicarious experiences and learning from them.
44
45 Self-efficacy beliefs are formed from past successes and hence these managers are likely to
46
47 have more instances of successful experiences. Research has also recorded the relationship
48
49 between self-efficacy and persistence in effort (Multon, Brown, and Lent, 1991). Individuals
50
51 with higher self-efficacy beliefs are also found to invest more in learning (Bassi *et al.*, 2007).
52
53

54
55 Individuals with *high self-efficacy beliefs* are more motivated to engage in behaviours
56
57 that demonstrate persistence and hard work, especially when faced with difficult situations
58
59 (Bandura, 1997; Schunk, 1981). In the context of KT, where the individuals have to evaluate
60

1
2
3 and interpret the incoming knowledge, assess different alternatives and make judgements based
4
5 on the knowledge they possess, they face a lot of challenges and uncertainties. In these
6
7 situations, self-efficacy beliefs determine their individual perception of the challenges involved
8
9 and the belief in one's capabilities to remain committed to the task at hand (Salanova *et al.*,
10
11 2014). Self-efficacy beliefs influence the manner in which individuals motivate themselves,
12
13 think and behave. They have a vital role in the self-regulation of motivation and hence are
14
15 considered a key source of cognitive motivation (Bandura, 1991, 1993). Thus, individuals with
16
17 high self-efficacy beliefs may persevere more with the effort required to interpret and assess
18
19 this incoming knowledge, and generate more possibilities to create benefits from this
20
21 knowledge.

22
23
24
25
26 Individuals with *low self-efficacy beliefs* on the other hand will be easily deterred by the
27
28 challenges encountered with assessing and interpreting this new incoming knowledge. They
29
30 may believe that they do not have the required skills or capabilities to engage with this
31
32 knowledge and may not be motivated enough to further derive benefits from the same.
33
34 Therefore, individual recipients high in self-efficacy are more likely to make greater sense of
35
36 the incoming knowledge and come up with effective ways to utilize the knowledge, given their
37
38 wider experience with achieving success, facing challenges, and their ability to learn
39
40 vicariously. Hence, they are more likely to gain confidence in the incoming knowledge as a
41
42 result of their effective interpretation and assessment of this knowledge.

43
44
45
46
47 *Proposition 3: Greater an individual's self-efficacy, the greater the confidence in*
48
49 *transferred knowledge.*

50 51 52 **Regulatory focus**

53
54 According to the regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1987, 1997), two types of foci - promotion
55
56 and prevention- underpin people's behaviour. Regulatory focus is a motivational condition
57
58 (motivated cognition), where some individuals are more motivated to move towards desired
59
60

1
2
3 outcomes (promotion focus) while others are more motivated to move away from undesirable
4
5 outcomes (prevention focus) (Higgins, 1998). Promotion-focussed individuals are motivated
6
7 to engage in behaviours that align themselves with their ideal selves by seeking to maximize
8
9 the product of their outcome expectations and outcome valences (Crowe and Higgins, 1997).
10
11 Promotion focussed individuals are also more creative, extraverted and learning oriented (Baas,
12
13 De Dreu, and Nijstad, 2008; Gorman *et al.*, 2012) when compared to prevention focussed
14
15 individuals.
16
17

18
19 We draw from two important findings from this stream of research to argue that
20
21 promotion and prevention focused individuals are likely to differ in their ability and motivation
22
23 to make sense of the incoming knowledge and further utilize it. First, research has recorded
24
25 that *prevention focused individuals* are more sensitive to losses (Trudel, Murray, and Cotte,
26
27 2012), and display a conservative bias in decision-making (Crowe and Higgins, 1997). We
28
29 infer that individuals with a *prevention focus* are more likely to be conservative in their
30
31 decisions and are likely to discount innovative opportunities to put the incoming knowledge to
32
33 use, that depart from conventional mode of thinking and entail a certain amount of risk. On the
34
35 other hand, *promotion focused individuals*, uninhibited by the conservative bias and loss
36
37 aversion, are able to come up with creative ways to employ the incoming knowledge, which
38
39 enhances confidence in knowledge.
40
41
42
43

44
45 Second, it has been shown that *promotion focused individuals* are more likely to engage
46
47 in relational processing of information whereas *prevention focused individuals* are more likely
48
49 to engage in item level processing of information (Zhu, 2003). Relational processing of
50
51 information focuses on similarities, connections, and interrelationships among the knowledge
52
53 items as well as between these items and relevant external knowledge. Item level processing,
54
55 on the other hand, focuses on the specific details of each item (Hunt and Einstein, 1981).
56
57 Through relational processing of the received knowledge, promotion focused individuals are
58
59
60

1
2
3 likely to generate multiple hypotheses regarding the possible uses of the incoming knowledge,
4 which leads to greater confidence in the knowledge. On the other hand, prevention focused
5 individuals, through item level processing, are not likely to generate several hypotheses, and
6 their confidence in knowledge will remain low.
7
8
9
10
11

12 *Proposition 4: Promotion focused individuals are likely to gain more confidence in the*
13 *transferred knowledge when compared to prevention focused individuals.*
14
15
16
17

18 ***Positive feedback from social interactions***

19
20 Social interaction in an organisational context is the extent of interaction that the individual
21 engages with others in his/her network, which in this case could be peers within the
22 organization. This has been often used in several studies as representing the structural element
23 of social capital (Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). The extent of
24 interaction depends on the ties that the individual has established within his organisation. Such
25 interactions provide channels for mutual exchange of ideas and information and has been found
26 to cater to knowledge exchanges and KT (Inkpen and Tsang, 2005; Lane and Lubatkin, 1998).
27 Social interactions facilitate collective learning and repeated interactions create an environment
28 of reciprocity and mutual obligation (Muthuswamy and White, 2005).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 As per the socio-cognitive view, individuals interact with others in their organization and
42 during these interactions, the views, opinions, and concepts from others could be used to form
43 their own meaning of the incoming knowledge (Simonet *et al.*, 2015). Common meanings are
44 formed by way of such interactions (Tsai, 2001), mainly through feedback. Feedback can
45 improve individual's learning and can also motivate them to pursue their efforts (Belschak and
46 Den Hartog, 2009). Such feedback from colleagues within the organisation could also help
47 them get their approval and verification (external validity) for the individual's own ideas and
48 concepts pertaining to the new knowledge. This in turn could help them gain more confidence
49 in the incoming knowledge. Hence the type, quality and nature of cues emerging from these
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 social interactions (Simonet *et al.*, 2015), are likely to affect the confidence building process.
4
5 Prior research has noted the role of feedback in enhancing calibration of confidence judgments
6
7 (Lichtenstein and Fischhoff, 1980), which in the present context results in better confidence.
8
9
10 Individuals often have the tendency to seek affirmative opinions from peers as part of their
11
12 social exchanges (Simonet *et al.*, 2015), which could boost confidence in the incoming
13
14 knowledge. Affirmative interactions can thus earn better appreciation and approval for the new
15
16 knowledge, which will promote the required confidence to engage further with the incoming
17
18 knowledge.
19
20

21
22 *Proposition 5: Greater the extent of positive/affirmative feedback that individuals receive*
23
24 *(in support of the incoming knowledge) from their social interactions, greater the*
25
26 *confidence in the transferred knowledge.*
27
28

29 ***Perceived degree of novelty***

30
31
32 Novelty, in the KT context, refers to the perceived originality of the target knowledge (Jung
33
34 and Lee, 2016), which could be new to the individual (as a recipient). Knowledge that is
35
36 perceived to be novel could be viewed as valuable and not common and hence could be linked
37
38 to the potential to create a competitive differentiation (Barney, 1991; Grant, 1996). Hence, it
39
40 is possible that such knowledge earns higher recognition from individuals and be considered
41
42 as a more stimulating input (Jung and Lee, 2016). In turn, this value perception associated with
43
44 novelty enhances confidence in this knowledge.
45
46

47
48 However, engaging with this kind of knowledge could also be treading on unfamiliar
49
50 territory (Wang and Libaers, 2016) for the recipient. The extent of unfamiliarity again depends
51
52 on the perceived degree of novelty and to what extent this knowledge is related to the
53
54 knowledge held by the individual. This unfamiliarity could heighten the perceived risk of
55
56 acting on this knowledge further. This could, in turn, potentially affect the individual's
57
58 confidence in the incoming knowledge and challenge the individual's cognitive capabilities
59
60

1
2
3 (Smith, 2016). This will further dampen their confidence in the usability of very novel
4 knowledge. Hence, the perceived novelty of incoming knowledge could either boost the
5 recipient's confidence levels or dampen it. Within reasonable degree of perceived novelty, it
6 would be perceived as attractive or beneficial by the individual and hence may have a positive
7 impact on the confidence in this knowledge. Beyond this threshold limit, higher degrees of
8 perceived novelty could turn out to be a liability, perceived as risky by the recipient, and hence
9 negatively influence the confidence in this knowledge.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Proposition 6: The individual recipient's confidence in the transferred knowledge has an*
20 *inverted-U relationship with the perceived degree of novelty of target knowledge.*
21
22
23
24

25 ***Moderating effects of individual factors on the relationship between novelty and confidence***

26
27 The identified individual factors, through their positive effects on confidence, shift the point of
28 inflection of the novelty-confidence relationship to the right. This argument will be
29 tautological. Rather, our interest is in specifying effects that operate through their impact on
30 the novelty-confidence relationship.
31
32
33
34
35

36 Perceived novelty of knowledge can contribute to ambiguity in individuals stemming
37 from unfamiliarity and his/her cognitive limitations, and not knowing how best to use it.
38 Individuals who have high need for closure do not tolerate ambiguity well (Kruglanski, 2004).
39 Therefore, for these individuals, even moderate levels of perceived novelty can lead to
40 discomfort and thereby lower confidence. On the other hand, individuals with low need for
41 closure tolerate the ambiguity well and are able to think about the potential uses of the novel
42 knowledge. Therefore, for low need for closure individuals, the novelty-confidence
43 relationship will be positive for greater levels of novelty.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Individuals with greater levels of self-efficacy would have to overcome challenges to
56 accomplish several things, since past successes are key to self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977).
57 As such, they are less likely to be deterred by the challenges posed by high degree of perceived
58
59
60

1
2
3 novelty. Their ability to learn vicariously also prepares them to deal with greater levels of
4
5 novelty. Therefore, individuals with greater levels of self-efficacy beliefs will be deterred only
6
7 by higher levels of perceived novelty, compared to less self-efficacious individuals who would
8
9 find it difficult to cope with more than a medium level of perceived novelty.
10
11

12 Promotion-focused individuals are better equipped to handle novelty, compared to
13
14 prevention focused individuals. The unfamiliarity and the cognitive limitations associated with
15
16 the perceived novelty of incoming knowledge enhances the perceived risks involved in using
17
18 it. Prevention focused individuals will have difficulty dealing with greater levels of perceived
19
20 novelty as they are risk averse and conservative in decision-making (Crowe and Higgins,
21
22 1997). However, promotion focused individuals, unconstrained by risk aversion, are able to
23
24 cope with and make sense of novel knowledge. It was also argued that promotion focused
25
26 individuals are likely to engage in relational processing of information, whereas prevention
27
28 focused individuals are likely to engage in item level processing (Zhu, 2003). Relational
29
30 processing, through greater linkages and associations with relevant internal and external
31
32 knowledge, enables individuals to make better sense of knowledge associated with greater
33
34 levels of novelty. Hence, compared to prevention focused individuals, promotion focused
35
36 individuals will exhibit positive relationship between novelty and confidence at greater levels
37
38 of novelty. The proposed shift in inflection has been graphically represented in figure 3.
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Proposition 7a: Low (vs high) need for closure (NFC) will shift the point of inflection of*
45 *the novelty-confidence relationship to the right.*
46
47

48 *Proposition 7b: High (vs low) levels of general self-efficacy (SE) will shift the point of*
49 *inflection of the novelty-confidence relationship to the right.*
50
51

52 *Proposition 7c: Promotion (vs prevention) focus will shift the point of inflection of the*
53 *novelty-confidence relationship to the right.*
54
55
56
57
58

59 -----
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Insert Figure. 3 here

Discussion and Conclusions

This paper explores the plausible individual level differences in motivated cognition that could influence the individual's confidence in the potentially useful incoming knowledge and subsequently the possibility of deriving benefits from the same, in the context of KT. While doing so, the conceptual model that has been developed takes into account the contextual influences viz. positive feedback from social interactions and perceived novelty of target knowledge, which can influence an individual's confidence and subsequently his/her possibility of deriving benefits from KT. The above-mentioned factors jointly influence individual's confidence in the incoming knowledge, which in turn prompts the individual to further engage (or act) with this knowledge and thereby enhance the potential to realize benefits from this. The paper thus contributes to a better understanding of a phenomenon that has not attracted much attention from scholars – why some individuals are better equipped to gain benefits from potentially useful transferred knowledge.

One of the main contributions of this paper is that it attempts to explore the micro-foundations of KT. The extant literature on KT discusses the discrepancies between the extent of knowledge transferred and the actual benefits derived from the same (Ambos and Ambos, 2009; Lind and Kang, 2017). The focus of such discussions has been largely pertaining to the firm-level factors like absorptive capacity, organisational resources, mechanisms and structures, and socio-cultural aspects. The role of the individual and his/her socio-cognitive processing of the incoming knowledge in evaluating, interpreting and assessing this knowledge have been seldom explored. This paper seeks to address this gap in the extant KT literature that deter individuals from extracting benefits from potentially useful transferred knowledge from other organisational units. Scholars have noted that KT literature often disregards the

1
2
3 influence of individual actors, who often detect this knowledge, receive it, assess the same and
4 take it forward as required (Argote and Ingram, 2000; Foss and Pederson, 2004). There are a
5 few exceptions to this, since some studies have started to give more attention to individual level
6 influences (Regner, 2003, 2005; Ringberg and Reihlen, 2008). Organizations are made up of
7 individuals and hence their actions and interactions are likely to influence organizational
8 outcomes or other firm level constructs. Having said that, other levels of analysis are equally
9 important (viz. groups or networks, firm, industry, and macro-environment). In fact, each level
10 provides researchers with different perspectives that could complement one another and
11 provide a holistic view of the phenomenon under investigation (Foss and Pederson, 2004).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 The interplay between mental models and strategic choices have been explored in the
25 past (c.f. Kaplan, 2011), depicting the interaction of cognition with organizational factors to
26 influence strategic outcomes (such as decision-making, performance, and capabilities), which
27 has led to a stream of research on managerial cognition. Although extant KT research has
28 examined the effects of various organizational mechanisms on KT, they have not examined the
29 effects of cognitively generated motivation that prompts certain individuals to engage more
30 with the incoming knowledge. This makes a strong theoretical contribution in advancing our
31 current understanding on deriving benefits from KT in terms of individuals' socio-cognitive
32 models. The contribution is timely as well, given the current emphasis on micro-foundational
33 bases of strategy.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 The role of individual level variables (based on cognitive motivation) has potential
48 practical implications as well. All the individual level constructs could be manipulated or
49 influenced by suitable organizational interventions and situational effects to increase the
50 likelihood of gaining confidence (in the incoming knowledge) when individuals are engaged
51 in KT. For example, prior research has shown that regulatory focus can be induced. Roney,
52 Higgins, and Shah (1995) found that promotion focus can be induced through feedback.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Similarly, time pressure, aversive uncertainty and mental fatigue is seen to induce higher levels
4 of need for closure (Kruglanski and Webster, 1991; Livi et al., 2014). Additionally, coaching
5 or training, job autonomy and the extent of support available from the work environment is
6 found to enhance self-efficacy in individuals (Baron and Morin, 2009; Sousa, Coelho, and
7 Guillamon-Saorin, 2012). This also includes having more ICT related tools and infrastructure
8 (as support from the work environment) to aid employees' knowledge related endeavours,
9 which can also improve their self-efficacy. Hence, organisational design warrants more
10 attention, so that employees have a working environment that is conducive to gaining
11 confidence (via cognitive motivation) in new incoming knowledge that is potentially useful,
12 leading on to subsequent processing and action of the same.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Further, from a human resources perspective, organisations can also benefit from
27 recruiting personnel (during selection process) with better motivated cognition (with such
28 natural tendencies). Besides focussing on selection, managers can also ensure better career
29 progression, reward mechanisms and professional development for such employees. This can
30 foster an environment where new knowledge and information, which are potentially useful to
31 the firm are better accepted and acted upon. This in turn enables driving positive changes within
32 the organisation and could also make them more innovative.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 One of the limitations of this paper is that individual's socio-cognitive models are not
43 limited to the few factors that have been elaborated in this paper. Future research could also
44 explore other individual difference variables such as need for cognition. It also needs to be
45 noted that in order for empirical models to tease out the individual-level influences, the models
46 need to be controlled for relevant firm-level effects. To overcome this limitation, studies could
47 control for firm-level effects by situating the study in the context of individuals within a firm
48 or similar firms. Further, realising the benefits from KT often takes time and hence longitudinal
49 designs would be better equipped to investigate this.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Another key contribution of the paper is the introduction of confidence in knowledge as
4 a useful concept to the study of KT. Confidence in knowledge is a concept that has attracted
5 wide attention by researchers in psychology and decision theory (Alba and Hutchinson, 2000;
6 Yates *et al.*, 1997). However, the concept has not been well explored by strategy and
7 management scholars (Pillai, 2010). Since knowledge is about action, and confidence in
8 knowledge is a prerequisite for action, this is a very useful concept. This paper calls for further
9 research on this important concept in strategy and management.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Importantly, the construct of confidence in knowledge can inform the study of an allied
20 topic- that of separating useful from not useful knowledge. Studies in decision theory have
21 shown that heuristics outperform rational methods when the choice is complex and the
22 availability of alternatives increase (Bettman, Luce, and Payne, 1998). We contend that
23 confidence in knowledge can act as a heuristic, guiding managers to select the right knowledge
24 to use and discard useless knowledge, when faced with an influx of a large amount of
25 knowledge. This assertion has important implications to the study of knowledge transfer.
26 Future research can examine this issue, teasing out its implications better.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The paper makes another important contribution in examining the relatively under-
39 explored link between individual's confidence and the target knowledge context viz. perceived
40 knowledge novelty. Very few studies on KT investigate aspects linked to the perceived quality
41 of the knowledge involved in the transfer. The few studies that have adopted this line of
42 thinking have focussed mainly on the tacit and explicit dimensions of knowledge and relevance
43 of knowledge (Dhanaraj *et al.*, 2004; Yang *et al.*, 2008). Considering that most knowledge
44 transfers are initiated when the target knowledge is deemed relevant and something that the
45 recipients do not have, such knowledge is likely to be associated with some degree of novelty
46 from the recipient's perspective. Perceived novelty is an interesting attribute that warrants
47 further inquiry since it induces a certain level of unfamiliarity into the context, which could
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 affect the recipient's confidence and could be detrimental or favourable depending on the
4 extent of novelty as perceived by the recipient. The individual socio-cognitive frameworks
5 could further moderate their perception of novelty and the resulting confidence, which is
6 another significant theme explored through this paper. Another limitation of this study is that
7 it does not account for the effects of other knowledge attributes as perceived by the recipient,
8 which are relevant to the context. Future studies could focus on other aspects that are part of
9 the knowledge context (such as supplementarity or complementarity of knowledge), which also
10 could contribute to perceived quality of target knowledge.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 This limitation also applies to the assumption of only explicit knowledge being
22 considered towards the development of the current conceptual model. Future studies could also
23 look at tacit elements, where the micro-level mechanisms would be more complex, since the
24 transfer and assessment of such knowledge is difficult as it is deeply embedded within the
25 individual and linked to shared experiences (Nonaka, 1994). Hence, the focus could be more
26 on individual collaborations using mechanisms that facilitate the comprehension and further
27 engagement with this knowledge. The usage of metaphors or meaningful dialogues and the
28 actual observation of someone in action (Nonaka, 1994) might help individuals comprehend
29 and assess such knowledge and further gain confidence. Hence, a qualitative exploration of
30 these micro-level mechanisms could be the starting point for such studies.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Perceived novelty of knowledge in the context of KT has important practical implications
45 for managers. Managers need to be aware of the fact that too much novelty (as perceived by the
46 recipient) can impede or dampen the further processing of incoming knowledge as it stretches
47 the cognitive boundaries of the individuals engaged in the transfer. This would mean that in
48 such situations individuals might not be able to make sense of this knowledge nor come to grips
49 with ways to put this knowledge to use. This may also discourage them from engaging
50 effectively with further processing of this knowledge. Given that KT is a costly and time-
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consuming process, managers need to make proper assessments of novelty of the knowledge
4 involved in the transfer and take appropriate steps (make arrangements to provide more
5 background or supporting knowledge, more opportunities to experience and work with this
6 knowledge) to make the process efficient and effective. They also need to be aware of the
7 cognitive limitations of their team members, so that they can make better judgements on the
8 feasibility (investments required versus the potential benefits) of such transfers and/or plan
9 them better.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Future research can empirically test the propositions advanced in this paper. Literature
20 provides the measures for the constructs in the propositions. Future research can further
21 develop the model that we propose in this paper. The effect of other individual level constructs
22 on confidence in knowledge can be examined. Drawing from the socio-cognitive perspective,
23 the interaction effects of social interactions with the individual level variables are aspects that
24 can be explored further in the future. In addition, the implications of novelty of knowledge
25 need further examination. What are the antecedents of perceptions regarding novelty of
26 knowledge? What are the other consequences apart from confidence in knowledge? Studies
27 can also examine other antecedents and consequences of confidence in the incoming
28 knowledge. We hope that this paper will catalyse research in these areas.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Ajzen, I and Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Alba, J. W. and Hutchinson, J. W. (2000), "Knowledge calibration: What consumers know and what they think they know" *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 123-156.
- Almeida, P. Song, J. and Grant, R. M. (2002), "Are firms superior to alliances and markets? An empirical test of cross-border knowledge building", *Organization Science*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 147-161.
- Ambos, T. C. and Ambos, B. (2009), "The impact of distance on knowledge transfer effectiveness in multinational corporations", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 15, pp. 1-14.
- Ambos, T. C., Ambos, B, and Schlegelmilch B. B. (2006), "Learning from foreign subsidiaries: an empirical investigation of headquarters' benefits from reverse knowledge transfers", *International Business Review*, Vol. 15, pp. 294-312.
- Argote, L. and Ingram, P. (2000), "Knowledge transfer: a basis for competitive advantage in firms", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 82 No. 1, pp. 150-169.
- Baas, M. C. K., De Dreu, B. and Nijstad, A. (2008), "A meta-analysis of 25 years of mood-creativity research: Hedonic tone, activation, or regulatory focus?" *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 134, pp. 779-886.
- Bandura, A. (1977), "Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 84 No. 2, pp. 191.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- 1
2
3 Bandura, A. (1991), "Social cognitive theory of self-regulation", *Organizational Behavior and*
4
5 *Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 248–287.
6
7
8 Bandura, A. (1993), "Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning"
9
10 *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 117–148.
11
12 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.
13
14 Barney, J. B. (1991), "Firm resources and sustainable competitive advantage", *Journal of*
15
16 *Management*, Vol. 17, pp. 99–120.
17
18
19 Baron, L. and Morin, L. (2009), "The coach-coachee relationship in executive coaching: A
20
21 field study", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 85-106.
22
23
24 Bartlett, C. A. and Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing Across Borders: The Transnational Solution*.
25
26 Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.
27
28 Bassi, M., Steca, P., Della Fave, A., and Caprara, G. V. (2007), "Academic self-efficacy beliefs
29
30 and quality of experience on learning", *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, Vol. 36 No. 3,
31
32 pp. 301–312.
33
34
35 Becker-Ritterspach, F. A. (2006), "The social constitution of knowledge integration in MNEs:
36
37 A theoretical framework", *Journal of International Management*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 358-
38
39 377.
40
41
42 Bell, D. (1999), "The axial age of technology foreword: 1999", in *The Coming of The Post-*
43
44 *Industrial Society*. New York: Basic Books, Special Anniversary Edition, pp. ix–lxxxv.
45
46
47 Belschak, F. D. and Den Hartog, D. N. (2009), "Consequences of positive and negative
48
49 feedback: The impact on emotions and extra-role behaviors", *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 58
50
51 No. 2, pp. 274-303.
52
53
54 Bettman, J. R., Luce, M. F., and Payne, J. W. (1998), "Constructive consumer choice
55
56 processes", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp. 187-217.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bjorkman, M., Juslin, P. and Winman, A. (1993), "Realism of confidence in sensory
4 discrimination: the under confidence phenomenon", *Perception and Psychophysics*, Vol. 54
5
6 No. 1, pp. 75–81.
7
8
9
- 10 Boekhorst, J. A. (2015), "The role of authentic leadership in fostering workplace inclusion: A
11 social information processing perspective", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 54 No. 2,
12
13 pp. 241-264.
14
15
- 16 Brockner, J., Higgins, E. T., and Low, M. B. (2004). "Regulatory focus theory and the
17 entrepreneurial process", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 203-220.
18
19
- 20
21
22 Chen, C. J. (2004), "The effects of knowledge attribute, alliance characteristics, and absorptive
23 capacity on knowledge transfer performance", *R&D Management*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 311-
24
25 321.
26
27
- 28 Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W. and White, R. E. (1999), "An organizational learning framework:
29 from intuition to institution", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 522–537.
30
31
- 32
33 Crowe, E. and Higgins, E. T. (1997), "Regulatory focus and strategic inclinations: promotion
34 and prevention in decision-making", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
35
36 *Processes*, Vol. 69 No. 2, pp. 117–132.
37
38
- 39
40 Daft, R. L. and Weick, K. E. (1984), "Toward a model of organizations as interpretation
41 systems", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 284-295.
42
43
- 44
45 De Grada, E., Kruglanski, A. W. Mannetti L. and Pierro, A. (1999), "Motivated cognition and
46 group interaction: need for closure affects the contents and processes of collective
47 negotiations", *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 35, pp. 346–365.
48
49
- 50
51 DeBacker, T. K. and Crowson, H. M. (2006), "Influences on cognitive engagement:
52 Epistemological beliefs and need for closure", *British Journal of Educational Psychology*,
53
54
55 Vol. 76, pp. 535–551.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 DeBacker, T. K. and Crowson, H. M. (2009), “The influence of need for closure on learning
4 and teaching”, *Educational Psychology Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 303–323.
5
6
7
8 Dhanaraj, C., Lyles, M. A., Steensma, H. K. and Tihanyi, L. (2004), “Managing tacit and
9 explicit knowledge transfer in IJVs: the role of relational embeddedness and the impact on
10 performance”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35, pp. 428–442.
11
12
13
14 Eidelman, S., Crandall, C. S. and Pattershall, J. (2009), “The existence bias”, *Journal of*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Erev, I., Wallsten, T. S. and Budescu, D. V. (1994), “Simultaneous over- and underconfidence:
The role of error in judgment processes”, *Psychological Review*, Vol. 101 No. 3, pp. 519-
527.
- Felin, T. and Foss, N. (2015), “Individuals and organizations: thoughts on a micro-foundations
project for strategic management and organizational analysis”, In D. J. Ketchen & D. D.
Bergh (eds.), *Research Methodology in Strategy and Management*, Emerald Group
Publishing Limited: pp. 253 - 288
- Fischhoff, B., Slovic, P. and Lichtenstein, S. (1977), “Knowing with certainty: The
appropriateness of extreme confidence”, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
Perception and Performance, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 552-564.
- Fiske, S. T. (1992). “Thinking is for doing: Portraits of social cognition from daguerreotype to
laser photo”, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 877–889.
- Foss, N. J. and Pedersen, T. (2004), “Organizing knowledge processes in the multinational
corporation: an introduction”, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 35, pp. 340–
349.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, E. (1949), “Intolerance of ambiguity as an emotional and perceptual
personality variable”, *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 108-143.

- 1
2
3 Garud, R. and Rappa, M. A. (1994), "A socio-cognitive model of technology evolution: the
4 case of cochlear implants", *Organization Science*, Vol. 5, pp. 344–62.
5
6
7 Gioia, D. A. and Sims, H. P. (1986), "Introduction: Social cognition in organizations", In H. P.
8 Sims & D. A. Gioia (eds.), *The Thinking Organization: The Dynamics of Organizational*
9 *Social Cognition*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: pp. 1–11.
10
11
12
13
14 Goh, S. C. (2002), "Managing effective knowledge transfer: an integrative framework and
15 some practice implications", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 6 No. 1, pp. 23-30.
16
17
18
19 Gorman, C. A., Meriac, J. P., Overstreet, B. L., Apodaca, S., McIntyre, A. L., Park, P. and
20 Godbey, J. N. (2012), "A meta-analysis of the regulatory focus nomological network: Work-
21 related antecedents and consequences", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 90, pp. 148-
22 161.
23
24
25
26
27
28 Grant, R. M. (1996), "Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm", *Strategic Management*
29 *Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 109–122.
30
31
32
33 Guechtouli, W., Rouchier, J. and Orillard, M. (2013), "Structuring knowledge transfer from
34 experts to newcomers", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 47-68.
35
36
37
38 Gupta, A. K. and Govindarajan, V. (2000), "Knowledge flows within multinational
39 corporations", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol 21, pp. 473–496.
40
41
42
43 Hawthorne, J. and Stanley, J. (2008), "Knowledge and action", *The Journal of Philosophy*,
44 Vol. 105 No. 10, pp. 571–590.
45
46
47
48 Higgins, E. T. (1987), "Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect", *Psychological*
49 *Review*, Vol. 94, pp. 319–340.
50
51
52
53 Higgins, E. T. (1997), "Beyond pleasure and pain", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52, pp. 1280–
54 1300.
55
56
57
58 Higgins, E. T. (1998), "Promotion and prevention: regulatory focus as a motivational
59 principle", *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 30, pp. 1–46.
60

- 1
2
3 Higgins, E. T. and Spiegel, S. (2004), "Promotion and prevention strategies for self-regulation:
4 A motivated cognition perspective", In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (eds.), *Handbook of*
5
6 *Self-Regulation: Research, Theory, and Applications*, New York, NY, US: Guilford Press,
7
8 pp. 171-187.
9
10
11
12 Hunt, R. R. and Einstein, G. O. (1981), "Relational and item-specific information in memory",
13
14 *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, Vol. 20, pp. 497-514.
15
16
17 Inkpen, A. C. and Dinur, A. (1998), "Knowledge management processes and international joint
18
19 ventures", *Organization Science*, Vol. 9, No. 4, pp. 454-468.
20
21
22 Inkpen, A. C. and Tsang, E. W. (2005), "Social capital, networks, and knowledge transfer",
23
24 *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 146-165.
25
26
27 Jonsson, S. and Regner, P. (2009), "Normative barriers to imitation: social complexity of core
28
29 competences in a mutual fund industry", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp.
30
31 517-536.
32
33
34 Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W. and Sulloway, F. J. (2003), "Political conservatism as
35
36 motivated social cognition", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 129 No. 3, pp 339-375.
37
38
39 Jung, J. J. and Lee, J. J. (2016), "The quest for originality: a new typology of knowledge search
40
41 and breakthrough inventions", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 59 No. 5, pp. 1725-
42
43 1753.
44
45
46 Kaplan, S. (2011), "Research in cognition and strategy: reflections on two decades of progress
47
48 and a look to the future", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 3, pp. 665-695.
49
50
51 Khan, Z., Lew, Y. K. and Sinkovics, R. R. (2015), "International joint ventures as boundary
52
53 spanners: technological knowledge transfer in an emerging economy", *Global Strategy*
54
55 *Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 48-68.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kruglanski, A. W. (1990), "Motivations for judging and knowing: Implications for causal
4 attribution", In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (eds.), *The Handbook of Motivation and*
5
6 *Cognition: Foundation of Social Behaviour*, Guilford Press: New York; pp. 333–368.
7
8
9
10 Kruglanski, A. W. (2004). *The Psychology of Closed-Mindedness*. Psychology Press: New
11
12 York.
13
14 Kruglanski, A. W. and Webster, D. M. (1991), "Group members' reactions to opinion deviates
15 and conformists at varying degrees of proximity to decision deadline and of environmental
16 noise", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 61 No. 2, pp. 212.
17
18
19
20
21 Kruglanski, A. W., Peri, N., and Zakai, D. (1991). "Interactive effects of need for closure and
22 initial confidence on social information seeking", *Social Cognition*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 127-
23 148.
24
25
26
27
28 Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L. and De Grada, E. (2006), "Groups as epistemic
29 providers: need for closure and the unfolding of group-centrism", *Psychological Review*,
30
31 Vol. 113 No. 1, pp. 84.
32
33
34
35 Lane, P. J. and Lubatkin, M. (1998), "Relative absorptive capacity and interorganizational
36 learning", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 5, pp. 461-477.
37
38
39
40 Levin, D. Z. and Cross, R. (2004), "The strength of weak ties you can trust: The mediating role
41 of trust in effective knowledge transfer", *Management Science*, Vol. 50 No. 11, pp. 1477-
42
43 1490.
44
45
46
47 Lichtenstein, S. and Fischhoff, B. (1980), "Training for calibration", *Organizational Behavior*
48 *and Human Performance*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 149-171.
49
50
51
52 Lind, C. H. and Kang, O. H. (2017), "The value-adding role of the corporate headquarters in
53 innovation transfer processes: The issue of headquarters knowledge situation", *Management*
54 *International Review*, Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 571-602.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Livi, S., Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L. and Kenny, D. A. (2015), “Epistemic
4 motivation and perpetuation of group culture: Effects of need for cognitive closure on trans-
5 generational norm transmission”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*,
6 Vol. 129, pp. 105-112.
7
8
9
10
11
12 Maitlis, S. and Christianson, M. (2014), “Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and
13 moving forward”, *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 57-125.
14
15
16
17 Martin, L. L. and Clark, L. F. (1990), “Social cognition: Exploring the mental processes
18 involved in human social interaction”, In M. W. Eysenck (eds.), *Cognitive Psychology: An*
19 *International Review*, Hillsdale, NJ: Wiley, pp. 195–216.
20
21
22
23
24 Michailova, S. and Mustafa, Z. (2012), “Subsidiary knowledge flows in multinational
25 corporations: Research accomplishments, gaps, and opportunities”, *Journal of World*
26 *Business*, Vol. 47 No. 3, pp. 383-396.
27
28
29
30
31 Morandin, G. and Bergami, M. (2014), “Schema-based sensemaking of the decision to
32 participate and its effects on job performance”, *European Management Review*, Vol. 11 No.
33 1, pp. 5-20.
34
35
36
37
38 Morgulis-Yakushev, S., Yildiz, H. E. and Fey, C. F. (2018), “When same is (not) the aim: A
39 treatise on organizational cultural fit and knowledge transfer”, *Journal of World Business*,
40 Vol. 53 No. 2, pp. 151-163.
41
42
43
44
45 Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D. and Lent, R. W. (1991), “Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to
46 academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation”, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*,
47 Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 30-38.
48
49
50
51
52 Muthusamy, S. K. and White, M. A. (2005), “Learning and knowledge transfer in strategic
53 alliances: a social exchange view”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 415–441.
54
55
56
57 Nahapiet, J. and Ghoshal, S. (1998), “Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational
58 advantage”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 242–66.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nair, S. R., Demirbag, M., Mellahi, K., and Pillai, K. G. (2018), “Do parent units benefit from
4 reverse knowledge transfer?”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 428-444.
5
6
7
8 Nonaka, I. (1994), “A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation”, *Organization
9 Science*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 14-37.
10
11
12 Nonaka, I. and Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge Creating Company: How Japanese
13 Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation*. Oxford University Press: New York.
14
15
16
17 Parra-Requena, G., Ruiz-Ortega., M. J., García-Villaverde, P. M. and Rodrigo-Alarcón, J.
18 (2015), “The mediating role of knowledge acquisition on the relationship between external
19 social capital and innovativeness”, *European Management Review*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 149-
20 169.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Pillai, K. G. (2010), “Managers' perceptual errors revisited: The role of knowledge
27 calibration”, *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 299-312.
28
29
30
31 Pillai, K. G. and Goldsmith, R. E. (2006), “Calibrating managerial knowledge of customer
32 feedback measures: a conceptual model”, *Marketing Theory*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 223-243.
33
34
35
36 Reagans, R. and McEvily, B. (2003), “Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects
37 of cohesion and range”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 240-267.
38
39
40 Regner, P. (2003), “Strategy creation in the periphery: Inductive versus deductive strategy
41 making”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 57–82.
42
43
44
45 Regner, P. (2005), “Adaptive and creative strategy logics in strategy processes”, *Advances in
46 Strategic Management*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 189–211.
47
48
49 Regner, P. and Zander, U. (2011), “Knowledge and strategy creation in multinational
50 companies social–identity frames and temporary tension in knowledge combination”,
51 *Management International Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 821–850.
52
53
54
55
56 Reiche, B. S. (2011), “Knowledge transfer in multinationals: The role of inpatriates' boundary
57 spanning”, *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 365-389.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Reihlen, M. and Ringberg, T. (2013), “Uncertainty, pluralism, and the knowledge-based theory
4 of the firm: From J.-C. Spender’s contribution to a socio-cognitive approach”, *European*
5
6 *Management Journal*, Vol. 31 No. 6, pp. 706-716.
7
8
9
10 Ringberg, T. and Reihlen, M. (2008), “Towards a socio-cognitive approach to knowledge
11 transfer”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 5, pp. 912-935.
12
13
14
15 Roets, A., and Van Hiel, A. (2011). “Item selection and validation of a brief, 15-item version
16 of the Need for Closure Scale”, *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp.
17 90-94.
18
19
20
21
22 Roney, C. J., Higgins, E. T. and Shah, J. (1995), “Goals and framing: How outcome focus
23 influences motivation and emotion”, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol. 21
24 No. 11, pp. 1151-1160.
25
26
27
28 Rubini, M. and Kruglanski, A. W. (1997), “Brief encounters ending in estrangement:
29 Motivated language use and interpersonal rapport in the question-answer paradigm”,
30 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 72 No. 5, pp. 1047.
31
32
33
34
35 Salancik, G. R. and Pfeffer, J. (1978), “A social information processing approach to job
36 attitudes and task design”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 224-253.
37
38
39
40 Salanova, M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., Schaufeli, W. B. and Cifre, E. (2014), “Flowing
41 together: A longitudinal study of collective efficacy and collective flow among
42 workgroups”, *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 148 No. 4, pp. 435-455.
43
44
45
46
47 Sarala, R. M., Junni, P., Cooper, C. L. and Tarba, S. (2016), “A sociocultural perspective on
48 knowledge transfer in mergers and acquisitions”, *Journal of Management*, Vol. 42 No. 5,
49 pp. 1230-1249.
50
51
52
53
54 Schunk, D. H. (1981), “Modeling and attributional feedback effects on children’s achievement:
55 A self-efficacy analysis”, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 74, pp. 93-105.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sié, L. and Yakhlef, A. (2009), "Passion and expertise knowledge transfer", *Journal of*
4
5 *Knowledge Management*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 175-186.
6
7
8 Simonet, D. V., Narayan, A. and Nelson, C. A. (2015), "A social-cognitive moderated mediated
9
10 model of psychological safety and empowerment", *The Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 149
11
12 No. 8, pp. 818-845.
13
14
15 Smith, P. (2016), "Boundary emergence in inter-organizational innovation", *European*
16
17 *Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 47-71.
18
19
20 Sniezek, J. A. (1992), "Groups under uncertainty: An examination of confidence in group
21
22 decision making", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 52 No. 1,
23
24 pp. 124-155.
25
26
27 Sousa, C. M., Coelho, F. and Guillamon-Saorin, E. (2012), "Personal Values, Autonomy, and
28
29 Self-efficacy: Evidence from frontline service employees", *International Journal of*
30
31 *Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 159-170.
32
33
34 Subbotin, V. (1996), "Outcome feedback effects on under- and overconfident judgments
35
36 (general knowledge tasks)", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol.
37
38 66 No. 3, pp. 268-276.
39
40
41 Szulanski, G., Cappetta, R. and Jensen, R. J. (2004), "When and how trustworthiness matters:
42
43 Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity", *Organization Science*,
44
45 Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 600-613.
46
47
48 Trudel, R., Murray, K. B. and Cotte, J. (2012), "Beyond expectations: The effect of regulatory
49
50 focus on consumer satisfaction", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 29,
51
52 pp. 93-97.
53
54
55 Tsai, W. (2001), "Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: Effects of network
56
57 position and absorptive capacity on business unit innovation and performance", *Academy of*
58
59 *Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 996-1004.
60

- 1
2
3 Tsai, W. and Ghoshal, S. (1998), "Social capital and value creation: The role of intrafirm
4 networks", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 464-476.
5
6
7
8 Wang, S., Tong, T. W., Chen, G. and Kim, H. (2009), "Expatriate utilization and foreign direct
9 investment performance: The mediating role of knowledge transfer", *Journal of*
10 *Management*, Vol. 35 No. 5, pp. 1181-1206.
11
12
13
14 Wang, T. and Libaers, D. (2016), "Nonmimetic Knowledge and Innovation Performance:
15 Empirical Evidence from Developing Countries", *Journal of Product Innovation and*
16 *Management*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 570–588.
17
18
19
20
21 Webster, D. M. and Kruglanski, A. W. (1994), "Individual differences in need for cognitive
22 closure", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 67, pp. 1049–1062.
23
24
25
26 Witt, U. (2009), "Propositions about novelty", *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*,
27 Vol. 70 No. 1, pp. 311–320.
28
29
30
31 Yang, Q., Mudambi, R. and Meyer, K. E. (2008), "Conventional and Reverse Knowledge
32 Flows in Multinational Corporations", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 34, pp. 882.
33
34
35
36 Yates, J. F., Lee, J. W. and Bush, J. G. (1997), "General knowledge overconfidence: Cross-
37 national variations response style, and reality", *Organizational Behavior and Human*
38 *Decision Processes*, Vol. 70 No. 2, pp. 87–94.
39
40
41
42 Zeng, R., Grøgaard, B. and Steel, P. (2018), "Complements or substitutes? A meta-analysis of
43 the role of integration mechanisms for knowledge transfer in the MNE network", *Journal*
44 *of World Business*, Vol. 53 No. 4, pp. 415-432.
45
46
47
48
49 Zhu, R. (2003), "The influence of regulatory focus on consumers' general information
50 processing strategies. PhD Dissertation, University of Minnesota.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Individuals making sense of incoming knowledge




Figure 2. Proposed conceptual model

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3: Predicted moderation effects