



Research Article

A Linguistic Perspective of Knowledge Creation, Sharing and Its Novel Implementation

Dimitris Lamproulis

TEI (Technological Educational Institution of Thessaly),
Department of Business Administration, Larisa, Greece

Lamprou-dim@hotmail.com

Received date: 16 January 2017; Accepted date: 21 February 2017; Published date: 7 June 2017

Academic Editor: Simona Cătălina Ștefan

Copyright © 2017. Dimitris Lamproulis . Distributed under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

Abstract

The paper investigates the issue of knowledge creation, sharing and its novel implementation from a linguistic perspective. In that way, the current study distinctively evolves from Derrida's theoretical propositions which are shaped, examined and extended within an organizational context of Knowledge Intensive Firms (KIFs). Particularly, it is argued that language constitutes the ultimate means of perceiving and constructing any form of individuals' and organizational reality. Moreover, it is investigated that the use of language manifests a constant mental and physical inscription of individuals' effort to capture knowledge, create new concepts, share and translate them into innovative products, services and practices. Also, it is argued that language permits to understand any aspect of organizational reality from individuals' point of view. It gives the primary and the most fundamental medium to perceive knowledge, its creation and its transformational dynamics. Hence, the paper elaborates insights of a multiplied, an arbitrary and a constantly transcendental linguistically constructed reality within KIFs.

Keywords: Language, Knowledge, knowledge creation, knowledge sharing, knowledge implementation, innovation, Derrida, Post-modernism.

Paper type: conceptual

Introduction

Knowledge creation and its transformation to innovation are the main subjects of the current work within Knowledge intensive firms (KIFs). Examining previous studies, knowledge of employees constitutes crystallized beliefs, ideas and insights that are introduced by a pre-dominant social

process of manifesting innovations (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Cook and Brown, 1999; Brown and Duguid, 1998; Quinn et al. 1996; Edvinsson and Malone, 1997; Dougherty, 1992; Prusak and Cohen, 2001; Davenport et al, 2003). In these approaches, knowledge holds value to the extent that it is considered more or less an accurate concept that has a tangible impact

on organizational life. In addition, past studies assume that knowledge creation and its novel transformation into products rely on centrally directed discourses that are systematically utilized by firms (Alvesson, 1995; Deetz, 1992; Willmott, 1993; Tsoukas, 1996; Knights and McCabe, 2003; Kosmala, 2005; Scarborough et al, 2007; Brown et al, 2010; Karreman and Alvesson, 2004). In addition, the literature often refers to global organizations (NASA, IBM, Microsoft, Matsushita, Google, Apple's computers) so as to underline that knowledge intensity (especially through innovations) has changed and re-framed the laws of markets, customers' demands, norms of competition and internal operation of firms (Kunda, 1992; Hamel, 1996; Zack, 1999; Pfeffer and Sutton, 1999; Cros and Prusak, 2002; O' Reily and Tushman, 2008; Krogh et al, 2001). All preceding approaches, nevertheless, are overstated as they provoke reality showing only one falsified "productive-orientated" aspect of it and hide manifold others. They count on a one directional and a linear logic of organizational events according to which individuals' behaviours follow a performance orientated approach (Lyotard, 1984). Also, extant research on knowledge omits arbitrary incidents, multi-diversified conceptualizations, subjective feelings of individuals and manifold contradictions that shape knowledge creation and its translation into innovations. These issues are examined by current work as it is based on a linguistically constructed perspective. In other words, it is argued that language constitutes and constructs the ultimate ways and conditions for the creation of knowledge, its sharing and its possible novel implementation within organizational forms of life. Thus, language, in all instances, principally manifests any consideration of organizational reality such as, ideas, meanings, perceptions of objects, kind of relationships, ways of thinking, attitudes, space and time. This language, also, is argued to hold always a dual attribute as it simultaneously shapes and decomposes individual and organizational knowledge (Derrida, 1967). In addition, the present paper takes a distinct stance since, it views any aspect of working life to be in a constant linguistic transformational process

of becoming a (re)newed text that constantly transgresses its present past situation (Clegg et al, 2005; Kornberger et al, 2006; Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). Thus, a new knowledge comprises of intellectual and materialized forms of symbolizations that are organized by language each time. From that perspective, a new form of knowledge, also, is considered to move beyond individuals' wills and intentions and almost unconsciously and arbitrarily to constantly add a unique supplement of meaning (Derrida, 1967; Heidegger, 1962). This catalytically changes management's perception as it is argued that organizations become linguistically fabricated places that constantly escape any wilful (by staff) governability upon reality. That means that language and organizations are constantly manifested through both chaos and order while meanings, actions and behaviours are captured always after they happen (Derrida, 1967; Heidegger, 1962; Nietzsche, 1968, 1990). Also, it is argued that knowledge constitutes always of representations of linguistically constructed meanings. And, language hides and reveals parts of organizational reality since it never reaches its deep essence and its ultimate truth. Also, language orientates and captures knowledge temporarily while it creates the constant changeable conditions of its own presence (Derrida, 1974, Nietzsche, 1968, 1990). Furthermore, it is characteristic that language and knowledge take place and divulge on a verge between previous beliefs, understandings, experiences and newly articulated connotations that point towards a future. Conclusively, it is stressed that employees' knowledge depends on a language's articulation and it underlines every aspect of organizational life.

Additionally, it is argued that an individual's knowledge manifestation follows manifold linguistic paths simultaneously and a constant creative transformation (Derrida, 1974, 1981; 1988, 1987). In other words, knowledge emits from multiplied written practices, dynamics and it takes unpredictable forms. Also, language creates knowledge as it constantly distinctively vacillates in between polar meanings of individuals' thinking and actions

undergoing manifold subjective changes (Derrida, 2007; Deleuze and Guattari, 1983; Fox, 2002; Steinberg, 2005). In addition, the paper realizes that processes of knowledge creation, sharing and their novel implementation unfold through linguistically shaped games. They take place as a constant interchange and a dialogic relationship between different and similar linguistic categories that manifest an uncontrollable (and beyond individuals) dynamic that it interposes unique significations and interpretations. As a result, it is stressed that the arbitrary supplementations of language constantly insinuate to manufacture new knowledge (Derrida, 1967). In the same line of thought, a knowledge creation process, that aims to become an innovation, is shaped in between centrifugal and centripetal linguistic forces at all time (Derrida, 1974; Boje, 2003). That, further, presupposes that knowledge is elucidated and reshaped through individuals' *differences* of meanings (Derrida, 1974, 1967). Hence, language, as a living and breathing organ that manifests individual and organizational reality, constantly produces new knowledge that is based on temporary distinctions of meanings, words and their syntax. Conclusively, it is argued that, staff of KIFs find constantly themselves to an uncontrollable and dissolving process that decomposes the past and re-constructs a new present which re-defines individual and organizational life.

Furthermore, the current thesis seeks to understand knowledge creation and its innovative transformation within an environment of KIFs. This is chosen due to numerous reasons. Firstly, KIFs are theorized as "*companies where most work can be of an intellectual nature*" (Alvesson, 2000: p. 1101). Hence, individuals of KIFs are highly educated and hold an expertise. This creates a vibrant intellectual atmosphere which focuses on knowledge creation and its transmutation into innovation (Robertson et al, 2003). Secondly, KIFs are empirically examined to provide conditions of work that secure high freedom of individuals' thoughts and actions (Starbuck, 1992; Bolland and Tenkasi, 1995; Robertson and Swan, 2003; Brown and

Humphreys, 2006). Hence, KIFs are based more on individuals' effort and choices to create unique knowledge than in other kinds of organizations. Thirdly, it is argued by literature (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997; Scarbrough et al, 2007; Tenkasi and Bolland, 1996; Hamel, 2001; Fleming and Spicer, 2003; Sewell, 2005) that KIFs operate within turbulent environments and they need to meet constantly unprecedented and multi-diverse demands. This leads KIFs and their staff to face manifold and demanding challenges along with an unpredictable and a constantly changeable business environment. This raises an unintentional internalized intellectual intensity which pushes the staff of KIFs to constantly renew their systems of meanings and their understandings so as to produce ground breaking products (Brown and Duguid, 1988; Nonaka et al 2000; Quinn et al, 1996; O' Reilly and Tushman, 2008). It is a harsh process of knowledge becoming that requires an autonomy of individuals who actively and not only passively respond on present and future markets' demands (Brown and Eisenhardt, 1997; Alvesson, et al, 2001; Brown and Humphreys, 2006). This all aforesaid kind of analysis, however, assumes a pre-determined organizational environment of KIFs. Moreover, it considers language as a reduced tool that self exposes the truth of its claims. This leads extant research to believe in manifesting conclusive answers and to define an end of research within KIFs. In order to avoid that, the paper is directed to Derrida's theory which examines organizational reality to be in a constant self-deconstructed process. Thus, it is re-examined language and how it manifests new knowledge that transmutes into innovation within KIFs (Derrida, 1974; Boje and Jorgensen, 2008). Thus, emphasis is given to linguistically constructed conditions that translate knowledge, as thoughts, feelings and actions, into innovations. In addition, the paper's analysis refers to a perpetually changeable reality that encloses unpredictable and stable lingua conceptions within KIFs (Derrida, 1967). Moreover, it is noted the constant fluidity of individuals' views, thoughts and actions that critically change systems of meanings and re-build new conditions of work beyond any existent

pre-supposition of reality. Thus, KIFs are directed by language that shapes individual's will and aims to an unknown future.

Derrida's Theory of a Constructed Reality

Derrida's philosophical views are used as a cornerstone so as to understand the way that individuals believe to organize themselves, their thoughts and their actions in the effort to create knowledge that transmutes into innovations. Derrida (1974), like Wittgenstein (1972), argues that between individuals' will and literate action always intervenes the use of language. In other words, individuals through the lenses of language constantly construct a reality that is temporal, idealized and never (fully and accurately) representational of what actually happens or what is actually expected to happen in the future. Also, Derrida emphasizes language as a theatrical means of expressing ourselves and attempting an imaginary representation of reality. Thus, individuals use language to search, reflect on themselves and produce new knowledge that is fake (illusory) and simultaneously very real within a representational manifestation of reality. This linguistically constructed theatricality is a constant means of understanding of ourselves and others. Moreover, it addresses the concept of *differance* (a deconstructed term) which refers to a way of making linguistic distinctions and discriminations in the process of constructing meanings. It is a tentative and a fluid process which intermixes and surpasses past differentiations in unlimited unconscious ways. Also, individuals, in the effort to differentiate among concepts and connotations, refer to an always present and an arbitrary supplementation of a recalled signifier (e.g. a symbol of language). Thus, a repeated symbol, word or statement is complemented each time by a subjectively added conceptualization. In other words, Derrida argues that a relationship between signifier and signified is not stable and accurately repeatable since it is perpetually transformed as individuals add to it an always inconceivable new

knowledge. This re-frames their perception about themselves, their thoughts and, consequently, their working life. Thus, the recall of language always involves a creation of meaning and knowledge that adds something new and arbitrary (inconclusive) without having any direct origin and even a derivation from the past. Hence, language possesses an autonomous (self-sustained) life on its own and encompasses both order and chaos, stability and change, continuity and discursion. Language emerges from conflicts, contradictions and its meanings can only forcefully be extracted and created. Consequently, the moment that new knowledge is born, language is enforced to obtain a direction, an identity and a certain meaning without ever being able to conclusively retain it. Moreover, Derrida points out that unintentional spatial images, meanings, situations and events through the use of language follow an immanent interpretation and falsification. In another way, it is argued that language and knowledge move forward through constant (often unconscious and unforeseen) dissimulations of meanings and idiosyncratic discernments (testings, judgements and insight-fullness). These occur, not in isolation, as individuals shape local webs of interactions (discourses) that are constantly registered as they are mentally and physically re-written by their own subjective manifestations of reality (Derrida, 1967). Thus, discourses and their knowledge are viewed to be shaped similarly to a context of meanings. Discourses alike texts are restrictive and carry with them certain (social, economical, political and cultural) conventions and at the same time are open to new understandings. Because, they allow individuals' imagination and personal intention to move beyond stereotypical boundaries of thought (Derrida, 1967; 1974). Hence, it is vital to mention that individuals through discourses are involved in knowledge creation, sharing and novel implementation as they reiterate the importance of a sign, of a letter and a word—a symbolic recalling of their memory. That repetition leads the individuals to manifest a renewed story about the symbol, to add their own interpretation and to shape

idiosyncratic and subjective views of the symbol. Thus, knowledge creation, sharing and its unique implementation are subject of constant and unpredictable change that devolves from and shapes by the individual while he/she relies on a limited existent structure of meanings' construction and an initiation of a past symbol. Moreover, knowledge creation involves a dialogue, an interaction between individuals who come to hybrid and (re)invent ongoing manifold stories -an aggregation of knowledge- that are transformed into innovation (Derrida, 1967, 1981; Boje, 2011b). Hence, the innovative transformation of knowledge emerges out of local and momentary shaped dynamics, necessities and circumstances which simultaneously open new unexpected sequence of events, new de-construction of knowledge and new possibilities of knowledge creation (Derrida, 1974, 1981). Also, it is critical that language produces novel knowledge as it is re-constructed (added a new value) and de-constructed (dissolved to its elements or/and its basic uses) past meanings of words and sentences (Derrida, 1974). Thus, innovation is not a "frozen" signification, symbol or code of thinking but, a distant, abstract and often absent reminder of a past and a present re-assembled codification of a constantly altered future.

Furthermore, the concept of deconstruction that is based on Derrida's (1974) theory is analyzed. It refers to a chaotic multiplicity of meanings that derives from the language as the only means of expressing (organizing) human experience and creating knowledge. Thus, according to Derrida, all actions, thoughts and feelings of individuals are translated into and organized by writing. In other words, to write a text is the effort to fabricate reality, to produce knowledge and to replace a mental image with an object, a letter and a grammar. Clearly, for Derrida (1974) to write is the ultimate way of using language, he addresses that any vocal utterance or gesture or mute kind of communication reflects in writing. In other words, symbols and a process of writing are produced the moment individuals think, act and feel. Thus, the moment individuals articulate their knowledge, they define a form of

organizing thoughts, a certain ideology and a world view. Thus, writing is the ultimate way to trace the human history and its efforts, writing is first and beyond an individual's attempt to organize reality, to shape its methods and its techniques so as to give life and meaning to its existence. Based on that approach, Derrida (1974, 1981) points out that writing has the unique ability the moment a letter is assigned, it is simultaneously erased. It is transgressed to a new knowledge and a new experience. In other words, writing simultaneously (re)constructs (adds creative thoughts and ideas) and de-constructs (tends to efface the past and pushes towards a new composition of the present). More importantly, deconstruction provides the means to move beyond our own conceptualizations. It, also, gives an ability to playfully view ourselves and others in an experimental and a loosen way of understanding reality (Derrida, 1974, 1967). It is deconstruction that allows new reflections, testing and improvisations to take place so as knowledge creation, sharing and implementation be produced and theorized in an immanent manner. In addition, deconstruction allows to move *in between* what is conventionally acceptable and legitimate at a moment of time and what is possible and new to be raised. Thus, to de construct is to search, manifest and believe in a truth that lasts temporally and leads constantly to new revelations. Also, to de-construct requires unavoidably both to reflect on existing knowledge and at the same time to create your own knowledge of reality. Furthermore, deconstruction refers to an unexpected transcendence of dialectic reality that is created between polar meanings, terms and forms of actions. A linguistically imprinted and fabricated reality that evolves knowledge creation from arbitrary choices of connotations and meanings -a process that is present at all times within the manufacturing of innovations. Thus, Derrida argues that every individual action or thought or feeling is reflected in an organized form of mental, psychological and physical text which seeks a legitimacy for its own right. This enforces individuals to be immersed in a constant battle to de-construct meanings of a text and find a new language which will allow the

temporal establishment of a (re)newed "truth". Thus, knowledge creation follows an interminable de-construction of principles, beliefs and assumptions and it is built upon a need to organize a new text of reality. This process includes unintentional and arbitrary supplementations that add new meanings and interpretations of work. Thus, deconstruction initially calls for a lack of clear purpose to creation of knowledge that seeks for arbitrary supplementations and a need for submitting to past rules of a constructed text. Thus, deconstruction, as a pragmatic situation, constitutes the essence of individuals' will to move away of an existent context's (reality itself) closure, to constantly open new and unforeseen events and to take hold of their own future. Conclusively, knowledge creation, its sharing and its novel implementation enforce a decentralisation of individuals as the knowledge processes raise a multiplicity of voices (and interpretations) from various levels and corners of a new built text. Furthermore, deconstruction often underlines overlooked, inconsistent and dismissive points of a context which each time unpleasantly provoke established principles and differences in power. Thus, deconstruction forces for a reflection and a critic of fundamental aspects and theorizations of our existence. It pushes to constantly transgress deflections and inabilities while it settles always a reformed ground to understand reality. Hence, individuals create, share and implement novel knowledge out of a de-constructed each time necessity to put an order in chaos. In that way, individuals move forward and at a different stance (partition) backwards, they solve problems and simultaneously generate circumstances of obscurity, insidious potentialities and infelicities. However, it is vital that a deconstruction constitutes always a promise towards a solution of a problem.

The linguistic (process of) knowledge creation

The knowledge creation process occurs constantly within KIFs. Creative and skilful individuals hold the know-how to evaluate a situation and provide a suitable solution (Starbuck, 1992). That solution, however,

constitutes an idiosyncratic articulation of a creator and its origins derive from language (Derrida, 1974, 1987). In other words, the moment that a new thought leaps in mind, the moment that a new feeling and a meaning is born, it is the moment that individuals bethink letters to a linguistic representation. In that process, experts unintentionally and almost unconsciously attach a sense of truth and a meaning's beginning/end. Hence, experts-researchers are driven to legitimize boundaries of new knowledge, to establish rules of measurement and to follow a linear logic which beforehand ensures the causes and the results of knowledge creation that transmutes into innovation (Chia, 1996; Cooper and Burrell, 1988, Hassard, 1994). In other words, individuals of KIFs apply violence as highly suppressive methods that transform knowledge creation into an expected and a boundary-tied individuals' intervention. This highly logical and violent consideration of reality hides and omits the unpredictable nature of language and its arbitrary composition of meanings (Derrida, 1974; Kornberger et al, 2006; Kilduff and Mehra, 1997; Blackman and Imas, 2011). Thus, taking the unpredictable nature of language into perspective, the paper asks, what does it happen the moment that individuals shape an idea? What qualities carry the meaning of new knowledge that is produced each time? And, how does creation of knowledge become representational of a reality? The answer unavoidable directs to language itself. In other words, new knowledge constantly is produced linguistically through the recall of symbols and grammar (as a programme) that reassemble the mental and physical process of writing (Derrida, 1974). In that way, language constitutes the silent protagonist of a knowledge creation process that includes new perceptions of reality. In other words, language perpetually shapes the conditions and the concepts of a knowledge's creative evolvement. Moreover, it unintentionally adds each time new conceptions that change the nature of understanding about reality. This can be a new object, a technology, a machine and any novel concrete research result that constitute parts of a linguistically manifested individual or organizational text

within KIFs. Consequently, language always changes past meanings to new conceptualizations of thoughts and ideas. Also, language holds the attribute to move beyond certain conventional applications of symbols and grammatical rules and it introduces a multiplicity that dynamically shapes any perception of individuals' reality. Furthermore, language constructs short narratives as accounts of meanings and knowledge in and between individuals (Boje, 1995, 2011b; Kornberger et al., 2006). Thus, language constantly insinuates new categories, semantics and interpretations which change individuals' stories and their knowledge (Law, 2002, 2000). In other words, a scripted linguistic process of knowledge creation occurs and it takes many multi-diversified forms, direct and indirect dispersed directions that compose a new thinking within KIFs. In addition, it is characteristic that knowledge creation requests a coherence on linguistically diversified meanings which is simultaneously rotten and decayed due to individuals' subjective interpretations. Thus, knowledge creation is a result of an experimental and arbitrary linguistic process of replacing meanings, connotations and styles of writing. In this tentative process of writing, individuals are misrepresented and subsumed by the procedure to create meaning while they believe to be in control and to re-establish their identity, others' behaviour and materials' attributes within KIFs. Thus, individuals are constantly subject of a centralized and a decentralized creative process of knowledge. Furthermore, creative writing embeds multiply, decomposed and irreducible individual linguistic voices that manifest unique feelings and actions to creation of knowledge each time (Gergen, 2001; Clegg et al, 2007). Thus, knowledge creation refers to an amalgam of diverse constructed meanings that surpass individual initial thoughts and understandings. Also, knowledge creation evolves from the *difference* between rereading the past and rewriting the future. In between these two epochs of time, the new grows as metal image and material reality that follows unprecedented paths of feelings and actions. In other words, new knowledge

moves beyond any literate linguistic reference towards distinct and imaginary aspects of reality. It is the picto-phonographic transcendence of letters, words and statements that constantly fabricates new perceptions, abilities and physical acts within KIFs (Derrida, 1974; Sorensen, 2005). Conclusively, new knowledge is produced as a new kind of language that transcends the past and distorts the present since it opens each time new multi-dimensional possibilities of thinking/acting.

In addition, knowledge creation evolves from a dialogic relation that occurs between different *heteroglossic* inscriptions, written styles and genres of languages which co-exist and interweave each other within KIFs (Bakhtin, 1981). Thus, knowledge creation constitutes of multiplied lexical textures, a language's generic categories and idiosyncratic linguistic formations that denote meaning and value to a narrative of knowledge. In other words, new knowledge is constructed out of a play of abstract and concrete linguistic categories, and a game in between stable and imaginary linguistic representations (Derrida, 1967, Fox, 2002). Thus, unique knowledge is recurrently manufactured by new compilation of sentences, words and meanings that shape a new language. This incorporates distinct views that emerge unpredictably and act partially in between multiplied individuals' identities, genders, positions, roles and discourses. Thus, new knowledge decomposes past language(s) and creates a new language while it maintains inconclusive and ambiguous conceptualizations at present. Also, new knowledge raises and engages a dialogic composition between individuals' internal beliefs, views and voices, and it leads to their perpetual re-composition. In this process, the individuals deploy imagination and they become committed to new concepts. Moreover, they become story tellers who are simultaneously readers and writers of their own and others' story (Hansen et al, 2007, Law, 2000). They deceive themselves as they use unstable and fluid linguistic meanings so as to manifest the story of new knowledge each time. Characteristically, new knowledge is based

on an artificial (fake) unity of concepts along with their unending subjective interpretations. In other words, a narrative of knowledge creation, as an unstable point in time and space, engages authors and readers to draw their own unique lines of thought each time. And to centralize and to dissolve the new knowledge to manifold dimensions. Hence, knowledge creation acts as a metaphor of thought and meaning that is subjectively dispersed while it unifies itself uncontrollably to parts and pieces (Boje, 2011a). Characteristic is the case of Bjorkeng et al (2009) who explore a collaboration of a Public client and four Private firms-Engineering consultant companies-each with their own designated field of expertise (Alliance Collaboration). Findings show that, for each project, the private firms undertake an agonizing process of knowledge creation that seeks to fundamentally re-construct past institutional practises of innovation. The Alliance, instead of retaining a pattern of actions that secures the delivery of project construction within all cases, it has chosen, for each project, to search and to compose a catalogue of novel ideas which introduce new directions of thinking. These encourage a dialogue between individuals of different firms which creates new languages of project's work and it leads to outstanding novel solutions. Thus, the individuals of Alliance while they move away of a "dog-eats-dog" attitude, they immerse themselves in heteroglossal and unpredictable forms of communication that construct ground-breaking innovations.

Additionally, the inscription of knowledge creation emerges through improvisations of language (Derrida, 1967; Barrett, 1988). The knowledgeable individuals of KIFs, alike the members of a Jazz orchestra, hold unique skills and collaborate so as to alter past ideas into a future's unpredictable new products or services. In other words, the individuals test and invent new linguistically signified meanings that constantly fluctuate between what is known and what they imagine. Thus, they reach spontaneous and unforeseen perceptions that have no specific past or certain future. Also, new knowledge, alike a new musical piece of Jazz, is subject to constant

exploration and change (Barrett, 1988). Consequently, actors of KIFs use language to retain a distant memory of their creation while they keep searching for new realizations of their work, their role, their intellectual abilities and their participation in a constantly renewed innovative effort. Thus, a resulted knowledge creation encloses and produces multiplications of symbolic meanings; it never remains still in time, instead, it is expanded and it becomes subject of re-creative thinking within KIFs (Hatch, 1999; Clegg, et al, 2004; Cunha, et al, 2012). Furthermore, knowledge creation constitutes a re-inscription of the past which is constantly decomposed and re-assembled by new pieces of ideas and information within KIFs. Thus, new knowledge like a recorded part of jazz becomes an ongoing point of change and dislocation of thought and action within KIFs. This is achieved as knowledge is represented by linguistic symbols (materialistic, spatial) which are perpetually transcended and transformed opening new unexpected possibilities of knowledge creation in the future (Derrida, 1974). Consequently, knowledge creation follows a constant symbolic process of meanings' re-composition within KIFs.

The Sharing Process of Knowledge Creation

Knowledge re-production is a consecutive creative process which becomes a point of idea distribution and dissemination in and between individuals of KIFs. Individuals circumscribed enunciation of their beliefs, views, understandings and thoughts refers to a reducible system of representation, the *graphie (writing)* which constitutes a vehicle of communication (and not only) in and between employees of firms (Derrida, 1974, 1967). In that way, knowledge sharing (phonological, mute or written) occurs through two conflicting and simultaneously coexisting linguistic directions: the absent, the imaginable and the oneiric view of language and the expression of language as a literate meaning that reflects a self presence of reality. This leads to an arbitrary contradiction and an undetermined

linguistic configuration of knowledge. Also, a self presence of language always becomes a subject of individuals' interpretation that addresses an idiosyncratic and an uncontrollable supplement of understanding. Conclusively, knowledge sharing constantly manifests a misplacement of reality and a game of statements' falsehood that results in a re-invention of thoughts, feelings, space, objects and time within KIFs. Furthermore, knowledge sharing evolves from a play of a language's *differences* that are not directly imposed by individuals' intentions, wishes and thoughts. In that way, knowledge sharing develops an unpredictable dynamic and a self sustained proposition which constantly complements individuals' efforts and insinuates in the final construction of innovation. That dynamic of knowledge sharing, also, affects a linguistic structure (as a model or system of meaning) which consists of a representation of self representation of reality. Also, systems of meanings rely on a spatial recall and absence of linguistic rules and symbols so as reality be reached, formulated and subjectively complemented each time by unexpected notions.

Adversely, conventional theory claims that knowledge sharing can be deciphered based on a more or less accurate linguistic representation of organizational reality (Parsons, 1956, Kuhn, 1970; Mintzberg, 1973; Schein, 1992; Swart and Kinnie, 1993; Sveiby, 1996; Drucker, 1988; Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995; Hargadon and Sutton, 2000; Brown and Duguit, 2000; Prusak and Cohen, 2001). This approach considers that knowledge is enclosed in the meanings of language, an internalized self-supported process which does not relate to exorbitant forces of reality. According to that view, individuals and their networks utilize knowledge in repeatable forms through its absolute presence, its irreducible repetition of itself (Hargadon, 1998; Hansen et al, 2000; Hamel, 2001). Hence, the imaginable and often unconscious perceptions that influence individuals' decisions, symbolic and mental images within innovative-KIFs are omitted. The arbitrary interactions of events (and their dynamics) that transfigure each time reality and direct

individuals to construct new linguistic categories and significations of themselves, others and materials' attributes are also extracted (Derrida, 1974). Thus, any effort to evoke meaning from a linguistic structure of representation (speech) results in ambiguities and a semi-truth of reality since it allows individuals to impose their own views, re-shape a distinct grammar (as a code of understanding events) and set new subjective meanings. Also, knowledge sharing invites individuals to use language so as to de-emphasise certain parts of knowledge, paraphrase and intensify others. Knowledge sharing provides individuals with freedom to re-invent a subject under new combination of linguistic symbols, grammar and conceptions that can be materialized into an innovative product. This kind of individuals' interaction and intervention expand knowledge sharing on a statement of an independent discourse (scientific, experts', creative, corporative) that signifies certain meanings within specific time and space. And these discourses, nevertheless, are perpetually interpreted by an imaginary and an idiosyncratic use of individuals' language. Hence, knowledge sharing (as an actualization of a discourse) is subsumed to certain conditions of work and to certain moments in time, thus, it constitutes a fragmented and (simultaneously) an idiosyncratic linguistic representation of reality that further enforces individuals to participate in the emergence of new knowledge, to take new decisions and to think new possibilities within the process of constructing innovations. For instance, Steinberg (2005) empirically shows that experts and entrepreneurs of IT make frequent use of a web site as a means of communication so as to network and to share knowledge in the UK. They constantly accumulate and disperse knowledge as they achieve to conclude new deals, expand their social relationships and perpetually redefine their leadership skills. More specifically, the aforesaid individuals, being in a perpetual process of innovative becoming, arbitrarily create new knowledge (attitudes, tactics, strategies, beliefs, representations, new technology and new relationships) since they are forced to uncontrollably fluctuate between polar

meanings and actions such as, virtual/physical contact, online/offline, professional/personal contacts, long-term/short-term policies, trust/distrust, effective/ineffective networking. As a result, they interminantly re-construct a language that produces new perceptions about their role, their interventions, their leadership skills, their colleagues and kind of work that they need to perform. In other words, they are engaged in an immanent game of communication so as to grow their business and reputation which requires to perpetually share and resettle new knowledge boundaries of their firms.

In continuation, knowledge sharing is a process of violence that relies on the recall of similar signs, repeatable grammatically codified conditions and identical concepts. In other words, knowledge sharing makes meaning through the imposition of linguistic rules that assume and pre-determine signs or letters to be the recollection of clear logos -the essence of all ideas (Derrida, 1974). And in that way, any interpretation of knowledge sharing takes away any sporadic direction of language as an important event that affects all language made situations, and it adds new supplementations of meanings. Also, it is omitted that sensibility of knowledge sharing each time evolves in between the use of general linguistic laws, and individuals' imagination. In other words, through general analogical perceptions and scripted laws of meanings, it is produced violently (suppressed) a language's reflections of shared knowledge which, however, always directs to personalized displacements of meanings and illusions of a reality. An effect that constantly guides to new lines of thought and their unavoidable major contribution to innovative materializations within KIFs. Also, knowledge sharing causes an inconvenience of exposure and a need for an undisputed closure whose, yet, concept constantly remains open to others' new abstractions and interpretations. That exposure, also, proclaims an intensified attention to new knowledge and a demand for a conclusive answer which is always scrutinized and re-constructed by others' understandings within KIFs (Gergen and Thatchenkery,

1996). Thus, knowledge sharing holds a ritualistic and a symbolic meaning that stresses the slip from one language to another. In this process, meanings are shaped in between past and present significations, old and present needs. In other words, knowledge sharing constantly enforces individuals to be involved in an ambiguous and trembling process of experimentation that seeks to establish one linguistic concatenation of meanings over others. Additionally, the interpretation of a shared knowledge evolves from a language's *bricolage* between utopia and atopia (Derrida, 1974). The utopia of re-inventing a completely new language that can fully sustain a future's new codification of reality and a new perception of events (new use of technology, new materials, new objectification of social relationships, new attitudes, new beliefs and new ideas). And the a-topia of being continuously conclusive in present, of avoiding unexpected linguistic attributes (and myths) and of using a language that is able to restore its former presence at all time; in other words, the atopia to express one true and general past language for all individuals. Thus, the *bricolage* creates tensions and directs unstopably knowledge sharing to a new uncontrollable conceptions and dispositions of meanings as individuals construct their own narrative of knowledge each time. Thus, individuals' process of knowledge sharing does not precede language (as a form of articulating and organizing meanings) and without referring to a glossal play of differences, situations and correspondences. This glossal game of meaning construction has significant impact on all aspects of organizational reality, particularly, if it is used creatively (Gergen, 2001; Anderson and Goolishian, 1992; Brown, 1990). Also, knowledge sharing addresses the desire of individuals to exploit and capitulate knowledge. This is accomplished in between a need of individuals to freeze meanings in time and space and a constant creative demand for existent knowledge's provocation which leads always to an intercepted form of knowledge. Moreover, individuals of KIFs are characterized by their life-passion to get a hold of new language and to manifest a new kind of knowledge that would ideally

provide the ultimate answers to all of their questions. This is achieved temporally in the time of *Festival* (Derrida, 1974). In other words, individuals live completely in the moment of knowledge creation and its distribution. Thus, the individuals, at the time of festival, possess an absolute belief in the self transparency of new knowledge as a self-evidence of language. That desire, however, is interrupted by the pragmatic need to perform, articulate meaning and express a certain preference and efficiency. In other words, individuals need to conceptualize their wishes into certain shapes of expression and action that meet and rewrite reality. In this process, language interrupts sharply individuals' imagination as it requires facing certain criteria due to its articulation and its application. Thus, novel knowledge sharing is formulated *in between* a pure individualistic wish to a new self-sustained knowledge and its unexpected linguistically fabricated transformation into a concrete conceptualization of reality. In other words, the new knowledge sharing is shaped in between a desire for a new kind of knowledge and an unending pleasure for knowledge application. Hence, knowledge sharing takes place through a language's interventions so as the initial desire for new knowledge not to reach its pure origin and to achieve an ideal formalization. Instead, knowledge sharing attains pragmatic and linguistically shaped representations of truth that never exist in pure and oneiric forms.

The Innovative Becoming of Knowledge

The transformation of knowledge into an innovative production is a process of representation of one sign with another (Derrida, 1974). In other words, materials, technology, space and money constitute significations that are in a process of producing innovative meanings and (re)new products. Thus, the innovation follows a process of signifying and signification that is analogous to language as the only means to address and codify knowledge into a novel product. Moreover, innovations (alike linguistic representations) are in a constant becoming of meanings that lack origin and

conclusiveness (Baudrillard, 1988; Latour, 1983; Burrell, 1997). In fact, to innovate requires to take an idea and test it in a language's game of differences that would result in new linguistic categories, sentences and novel constructions. This idea has no chance out of language, its meaning and its communicative spreading are vital so as to be considered, organized and legitimized by language as an innovative product (Chia, 2001). In other words, the capture of new knowledge follows a transcendence of present linguistically manifested relations between meanings and an attachment of a new potentiality towards the unfolding organizational life. At the same time, an innovative becoming of an idea requires an individual to comply with existent forms of language and agreed meanings. Hence, a novel implementation of an idea encloses an old and a new language, it is a vigorous transformation of an initial intention into an unexpected supplement as a conception that constantly deviates its meaning (Derrida, 1988). Moreover, an innovative implementation of a product is a representation of a vision or an oneiric image to symbolic acts, meanings and ultimate language. In that process, the innovation is produced as a spatial recognition of a new reality that it transforms into language and knowledge, thus, the experience of new knowledge adds on existent linguistic laws and order. Thus, past language is paraphrased to a consciousness of new potentials (new concepts, new feelings, new objects). Hence, the implementation of an innovation uses language as the only means to re-organize existent thoughts, feelings and actions of employees under new light as it adds new lines of thoughts, new kind of syntax and grammar. Hence, any innovative becoming lies on an edge between a past understanding of organizing a linguistically fabricated reality and its future possibility. In other words, a contradictory process of linguistic experimentation takes place (Bakhtin, 1981; Hassard, 1994) in which a novelty (idea, action, product) is primary captured and implemented as a new genre of a language. Moreover, an innovation constitutes an accumulation of new knowledge that is agreed between leaders

and knowledge workers which further enhances the desire for knowledge exploitation and ideas' dissemination in and between employees of KIFs (Clegg et al, 2004). This generalized acceptance of an innovation, yet, is only momentary and superficial as it actually consists of both a dynamic of agreement and dispute between staff of KIFs. Thus, the moment that an invention of a product or a method is manifested (as a point of success), it starts its decay, its unprecedented degradation towards the fulfilment of new raised needs. In other words, a refresh process of innovation has already started before it's been announced and realized by the individuals. That further produces an agonizing effort for a new settlement of meanings and the prevailing of a new language. Thus, innovation is always the result of a linguistic battle between what does already exist and what do various individuals immanently imagine to form as a new kind of an innovation within a KIF. Thus, any pro-claimed purity of knowledge, that manifests an ultimate and a self-sustained innovative solution, is a fictional event since it is complimented constantly by manifold articulations and interpretations of individuals. In other words, a continuous innovative becoming occurs within KIFs. It relies on a language as an incest of oneiric and pragmatic events, and it constitutes a necessary prohibition to explication and implementation of new knowledge. Because, ultimately, language follows a cyclical move, it is interrupted by pragmatic conventions and it returns to pure foundations of love which is an imaginable state of knowledge.

In addition, the constitution of an innovation is based on articulation of meanings. This takes multiple forms such as, a statement, a neume and a silence. In all instances, articulation of knowledge is an institutionalized process and an expression of nature's demand of an individual (Derrida, 1974). Thus, to innovate means to be influenced of others' knowledge and, simultaneously, to refer to personalized and unique knowledge. This second part of idiosyncratic knowledge is often hidden or omitted by extant literature. It, however, constitutes the most vital part for the

manifestation of innovations. It is the unique personalized need of individuals to express themselves which seeks new forms of a language and results into a new kind of product. From a different perspective, an innovation is build on a language that wanders between past organized texts or narratives of knowledge and their unique each time interpretations that derive from an idiosyncratic language of individuals (Derrida, 1974). Thus, an innovation constitutes each time a unique amalgam of the aforesaid two categories of language and it is driven unpredictably by them. Also, the reading and writing of existent knowledge direct employees of KIFs to a laborious transformative process of knowledge creation. This process, however, seeks to satisfy both the extreme passion of individuals to find out new knowledge and their intense pragmatic effort to transform it into an innovation (Lamproulis, 2007). Also, the construction of an innovation involves the active and not only passive use of individuals' senses (Derrida, 1974, 1981). Thus, the individuals of KIFs use their logos and active imagination so as to capture and elicit fragmented aspects of past knowledge that is intermingled with new elements of language and its semiotics. Thus, individuals indulge themselves in linguistic articulations that shift unexpectedly. These have no certain direction between past and present and claim a self-assurance for themselves. Consequently, no knowledge and no linguistic production can be repeated twice. As a result, the signifying process of innovation refers to general rules of arranging space, objects, individuals' behaviour and outcomes that they do not find a recursive application to any locality of a knowledge representation and articulation.

Additionally, language uses the substitution of signs, gestures and even muteness so as to construct meanings. That allows concepts of language to supplement each other and to reach an arbitrary accumulation of differences in the form of a new product. Thus, it is realized a new combination of attributes that emerge from the distance between signs and their significations within the process of constructing innovations. Furthermore, the

manufacturing of an innovation is based on the substitution, and the translation of a spatial language into a language of objects and their differences. This is an uncontrollable process between different linguistically manifested meanings which seek to establish a legitimate state of novelty for themselves (Derrida, 1977; 1974). Thus, an innovation constructs fake idealized ideas and promises that are only partially fulfilled and constantly transgressed to a new state of individuals' demands. For instance, Brown and Eisenhardt's (1997) empirical study shows that any form of innovation includes an arbitrary supplement of concepts that devolve from distance between interpreting present and future customers' needs. That perpetually alters the criteria to construct a selling success within Computer Manufactures. Hence, it is noticed that firms which are well-prepared and allow last minute substitutions of concepts, materials and methods, come closer to customers' needs and achieve a communication and a wide acceptance of their ground breaking products.

Discussion

The current paper provides a "Derridian" formalization of organizational theory, an insight and a critic of knowledge conceptualization, its creation and its transaction to innovation within KIFs. In that way, it is argued that knowledge evolves from language and constitutes both of fluid and stable concepts, linguistic rules and semiotics. In other words, language addresses imaginable wills, subjective manifestations and pragmatic innovative demands. It is the linguistic use of symbols that recall knowledge; they arbitrarily transgress it and re-compose new meanings of reality. Hence, language shifts and transforms constantly knowledge within KIFs. It is based on a working intensity to challenge restrictions of thinking and acting, it incites a constant conscious and mostly unconscious transformation of individuals' perceptions of themselves, wishes, relationships and materials. Also, it is the use of language that constantly searches for an application of knowledge in the form of innovation within KIFs. Thus, language's creative function relies on a spatial recollection of symbols

and meanings which it devolves unexpectedly without possessing any certain beginning and end (Derrida, 1974, 1987). Also, it is the esoteric and the intimate dimension of individuals' language which manifests interpretations and representations of new knowledge that takes the shape of innovations. Thus, the paper's distinctiveness relies on Derrida's theory and examines the linguistic construction of knowledge creation, sharing and implementation that translate into innovations. This kind of investigation is overlooked and differs considerably from Lyotard's (1984), Deleuze and Guattari's, (1983) and Kornberger's et al, (2006) studies which address knowledge from a different to current work's perspective. Hence, the paper argues that language is the ultimate and the most decisive way of creating knowledge that transforms into innovations within KIFs. Thus, language manifests new knowledge as it comprehends manifold paradoxical and contradictory meanings that are subject of deconstruction and not conclusive affirmations of individuals' thoughts and actions.

The above views are examined in a knowledge creative process that unfolds dynamically and actively by individuals within KIFs. This process addresses writing as the ultimate individuals' creation of reality that is constantly a subject of re-construction. Moreover, it is argued that to think or act demands to recall language and fabricate new linguistic categories and meanings that create knowledge. In that way, individuals can transmute imaginable wishes into praxis (Derrida, 1967, 1988). Thus, knowledge creation follows a linguistic transcription of a text which re-organizes past thoughts and adds new semantics and connotations challenging the nature of yourselves and your thinking. This de-constructive linguistic route of knowledge creation constitutes its very essence. Also, knowledge creation uses all symbols to frame a meaning and to escape it at the same time. Thus, knowledge creation revolts situations and events, it constantly questions its own basic understandings and raises new connotations of a language. Moreover, it is

pointed that knowledge creation lacks any self consistency while it relies on individuals' linguistic subjugation of grammar and concepts so as to produce new knowledge within KIFs. Thus, it is enforced any linguistic agreement between individuals. This is actually fake since its meaning constantly diverts and is replaced by new subjective interpretations of language. Therefore, the aforesaid consensus of individuals is technically imposed and while it is raised, it is transformed, diverted and subjectively internalized by language. It becomes uniquely adjusted to individuals' thoughts, plurivocal desires, conditions of work and manifold levels of their interactions. This creative and transformative process of knowledge, further, directs individuals of KIFs to novel decisions and to newly created events of work which, in turn, generate new ideas and re-shape their thinking. This constantly unknown and (re-)discovered future of KIFs aligns with empirical results that are drawn from individuals' identities within consultancy firms (Clegg et al, 2007; Sorensen, 2006). Conclusively, the current thesis argues for a paradoxical, an unpredictable and a multi-directional linguistic reality which constantly re-configures new and omits past elements of knowledge within KIFs. Thus, knowledge creation encloses stability while it is flexible and changeable. In addition, it is stressed that knowledge creation emerges from linguistic categories of meanings that rely on mentally fabricated differences (Derrida, 1988, 1981). Thus, language constantly guides to new and previously unexplored combinations between words and their semantics. This occurs both intentionally and (mainly) unintentionally by individuals of KIFs. In addition, it is claimed that language utilizes past conventional linguistic structures and meanings to a new shaped order of signs and genetic rules. Thus, knowledge creation constitutes a constant re-construction of past texts. Furthermore, the paper considers that knowledge creation embeds a dialogic intersection between different languages, linguistic categories and systems of meanings within KIFs. That differs from studies which are limited to linguistic

dialogic interconnections from a novel's point of view (Bakhtin, 1981). Also, current work differs from studies of Deleuze, 1994; Beech et al, 2001; Jeanes, 2006; Blackman and Imas, 2011, as it devolves from Derrida theory and refers to a linguistically founded process of knowledge creation that transforms into new products within KIFs. Hence, knowledge creation is considered to be shaped linguistically and symbolically. It is subject of unexpected controversies and idiosyncratic ways of thinking and writing. Additionally, the paper originally recognizes similarities between the composition of Jazz music (Barrett, 1988; Kamoche et al, 2003) and the subscription of knowledge creation within KIFs. In other words, it is claimed that knowledge creation occurs through linguistically manifested improvisations of individuals' ideas. It is the scripted characteristic of language that allows an idea to obtain a formalization and to transform substantially from a momentary captured new cognitive language into pragmatic results of work. Thus, improvisations of language result in composing new knowledge that responds to fluky needs of the present and enclose an undetermined future.

In addition, the current work explores knowledge sharing that transforms into innovations within KIFs. This process is argued to fundamentally link with the use and construction of language. In other words, knowledge transfer is based on the recall of symbols that hold their own dynamic and impose their rules and understandings upon individuals' thinking (Derrida, 1974; Chia, 2001). Hence, knowledge sharing constantly results in paraphrasing and changing conceptions, understandings, feelings, gestures, relationships, objects and ideas in and between individuals. In other words, knowledge sharing manifests each time its unique linguistic reproduction. Additionally, the paper stresses the imaginable, oneiric and absent aspect of language that interprets a shared knowledge and infuses it with new added conceptions that transform reality. In this changeable process, individuals of KIFs use pre-existing linguistic structures which are re-evaluated and reshaped into linguistically partial and

local systems of meanings. Furthermore, knowledge sharing counts on general categories and rules of language that constantly become subject of individuals' subjective interpretations, misconceptions and re-orientations. Hence, a shared knowledge translates always into new formations and meanings that surpass past pre-suppositions about reality. Thus, knowledge sharing directs constantly to new ways of thinking and to novel decisions within KIFs. In addition, knowledge sharing opens new unexpected and multi-directional possibilities for employees of KIFs. It encourages them to re-consider ideas and to re-create rules, methods and conditions that imprint a unique reality to the construction of innovations. Hence, knowledge sharing constitutes another way of knowledge creation and implementation. Furthermore, it is highlighted that language influences unconsciously and transfigures shared knowledge beyond individuals' wills as it constantly adds new, different and unique meanings (Derrida, 1974). That differs considerably from Boje and Jorgensen's (2008) work that emphasises the development of an ethical stance on language. Also, the research points out the linguistic violence that is applied (mainly unconsciously) by individuals and it imposes a certain cohesion and an ideology on texts and data. This habitual and exorbitant enforcement of certain rules on constructed scripts excludes an investigation into a multiplied perplexity of manifesting reality and its unpredictable nature that is constantly assigned by manifold organizational resources. Yet, the paper argues that knowledge sharing evolves from language, it is inscribed as short narration by individuals and it follows a process of language's reconstruction which encloses subjective misplacements of meaning. Thus, it is the act of writing as the ultimate way of understanding the process of knowledge sharing that leads to unpredictable forms of knowledge implementation within KIFs. Furthermore, the current thesis highlights that new knowledge is constantly comprised and transferred through a *bricolage* of a future (utopia) and a past (atopia) language within KIFs. Hence, innovative knowledge sharing is shaped in between two

conflicting languages. The first encourages a belief in constructing a future purified new knowledge that can be justified without any misconception. And the second holds a use of past language as a reflection and reference to past meanings that can stand conclusively on their own without mythical (imaginary) added concepts. This *bricolage* of language leads knowledge sharing to unpredictable and unique concepts that propagate in between true and fake considerations of organizational reality. In further analysis, the paper points out the time of *Festival* in which individuals of KIFs are totally immersed in their creative effort and believe in a purified form of language which would transfer undisrupted their imagination and vision. This knowledge sharing, however, is ruptured violently by pragmatic business demands-materials' behaviour, money necessities and defected relationships. Hence, the shared new knowledge never reaches its origin so as to obtain an oneiric and a purified form. Instead, the purified language intermingles unintentionally with pragmatic, always partial and incomplete linguistic necessities of articulation which return as an incest kind of new knowledges.

Furthermore, the third most important part of current work examines knowledge implementation that results into new products, services and practices. This process is argued to principally follow a language's representation of one sign with another. Thus, it encloses a constant deviation of meanings that become subject of randomized new conceptualization (Derrida, 1974; 1967). Hence, a new knowledge implementation relies on a linguistic translation and permutation of an idea into intangible and tangible elements. Moreover, a novel knowledge implementation follows an esoteric and an unknown process of ideas' re-inscription that establishes new meanings and forms of relations among individuals. Hence, the translation of knowledge into innovation transfigures thoughts, feelings and actions that reopen new practices within KIFs. Additionally, the paper stresses that novel knowledge implementation demands to re-compile controversial linguistic categories, written styles and concepts (Derrida, 1974;

Nietzsche, 1968). In other words, it is an idiosyncratic and intimate way that language seeks to comprehend knowledge so as to be inserted value and manifested innovations. Thus, individuals are constantly part of a linguistic process that unpredictably generates to final manufacturing of new products. This approach, although, agrees with Stephen, 1991; Peters, 1999, Ilipinar et al, 2011 to a generic consideration of creative organizations, it concretely emphasizes language as the most important means and process to produce innovations. Furthermore, the paper characteristically stresses that a new knowledge implementation follows a process of re-writing a new text of reality within KIFs. This demands individuals' imagination and dream's state of mind that transform past linguistically recalled significations into new unexpected potentialities. Thus, unique knowledge implementation constitutes of an internal conflict and a balance between fictional events and pragmatic requirements within the process of innovation. In other words, knowledge implementation evolves from an unpredictable incest of language between past and present, fictional and pragmatic demands. This linguistically driven process of new knowledge application reaches non-stop new understandings and new perceptions of materials, space and time within KIFs. In addition, novel knowledge implementation is guided by a unique language that includes both general and specific categories of meanings. Hence, language vacillates in between general cognitive conceptions and specific real applicable situations. Furthermore, the paper distinctively stresses that an innovative becoming of knowledge evolves from institutionalized generic rules of reading/writing and nature's distinct elements of individuals. This results in a constant personalization and a unique consideration of language within a project's innovative process. Also, it is argued that individuals of KIFs follow a linguistic discourse of symbols, concepts and grammar as existent systems of meanings that are uniquely interpreted each time within the manufacturing of innovations. Hence, the process of new knowledge

implementation substitutes generic mental images with unique and idiosyncratic by individuals' ideas, feelings and actions. Thus, new knowledge implementation constitutes (out of necessity) a temporal and a superficial agreement among distinct individual languages and conceptualizations. In further inquiry, it is argued that knowledge implementation is shaped by a perpetual mental and physical effort of individuals to make real what is viewed as possible within KIFs; in other words, to close the gap between knowing and praxis. In this intellectual attempt, individuals substitute past-language with new signs and significations. Thus, it is produced an innovative transcription from a spatial language to object's linguistic configurations. Consequently, individuals get involved in new unintentional completions of meanings, and the creation of concepts within the construction of innovations.

Knowledge Conclusions and Knowledge Openings

This part summarizes a few key points. **Firstly**, it argues that language shapes and articulates new knowledge within KIFs. In fact, novel knowledge is subject of linguistically codified meanings that are based on a distinct order of letters and grammar. Moreover, new knowledge counts each time on unique ideas, feelings and actions that are arbitrarily translated into linguistic symbols and grammar (Derrida, 1974). Hence, knowledge interlinks and differs from language. Also, the paper stresses that the fundamental intellectual process of writing consciously and unconsciously creates knowledge within KIFs (Derrida, 1974, 1981, 1988). It is the writing process that overcomes restrains, changes wishes and composes a new language's perceptions of reality that direct to manifestation of new knowledge and innovations. In other words, it is an imprinted linguistic process that retains (partially) previous individuals' thoughts, behaviours and simultaneously surpasses them as it adds every time new unintentional supplements of meanings -a new insight and a new dimension of reality. That can be a sign, a voice, an opinion, an

object, a goal, a wish, a kind of relationship, a feeling of love and death. And it can change reality fundamentally. Thus, it is pointed that any new spatial linguistic representation of life creates knowledge, and it emerges unexpectedly beyond individuals wills. **Secondly**, the present thesis highlights the linguistic complexity and unpredictability that take place to manifestation of knowledge creation, sharing and implementation within KIFs. Particularly, it is sustained that a linguistic articulation follows a perplex and undetermined process of ideas' symbolization and substitution among connotations and grammatical rules that shape new knowledge and its novel implementation. Moreover, linguistically manifested *differences* of meanings and individuals' idiosyncratic perceptions contribute substantially to knowledge creation and innovation. In addition, language provokes and alters past structures (or discourses) of meanings and creatively translates them into inscribed, localized and fragmented conceptualizations of reality. As a result, it is pointed that new knowledge re-organizes a reality for itself, it is fabricated by linguistic forms of life, it evolves interminably as a part of individuals' interpretations and it is subject of a language's constant deconstruction and re-composition. Moreover, it is pointed that plurivocal and multilevel linguistic events fabricate individuals' views and statements so as to emerge new knowledge within KIFs (Derrida, 1967; Kornberger and Clegg, 2003). Consequently, it is an accumulation of individuals' distinct languages and their differences that enforce for the construction of knowledge discourses. These emerge unpredictably by languages' manifested games of meanings rather than being subject of rules enforcement upon individuals within KIFs. The discourses are negotiated or embraced by individuals while language improvises tests and de-constructs them (beyond individuals) creating new ways of thinking and understanding. **Thirdly**, as a continuation of the above, the current investigation supports that knowledge creation and its translation into innovation constitute a result of individuals' subjective re-

inscriptions of rules, actions and thoughts within KIFs. They get involved in an uncontrollable (unrealized and unforeseeable) battle, game and experimentation to settle differences among linguistic categories, styles and meanings. In this process, chance and discontinuation have pivotal influence in the linguistic creation of knowledge that leads to innovations. Individuals produce textual representations of knowledge which possess a constantly altered and re-current nature without ever reaching the origin of truth (Derrida, 1974). Moreover, it is claimed that individuals of KIFs pursue the conceptualization of a pure language which always mingles with pragmatic demands and returns back incomplete and partial each time. This unlawful language always compounds general organizational categories of sense-making and nature's individual needs. As a result, individuals of KIFs are considered to manifest a sequentially renewed and incested language that holds a life on its own to creation of knowledge that results into innovations. This language constantly redefines individuals' unique needs and evokes a fresh demand for their fulfilment. Hence, KIFs constantly broach a new linguistic reality that is de-constructed, re-framed, internally guided (by language and individuals' minds) and repositioned towards an uncertain and an unpredictable future. Thus, it is suggested that future research could focus on empirically explicating how individuals are engaged in linguistically constructing different forms of knowledge creation, sharing and implementation that transmute into new services or products within KIFs.

Also, the current work has raised the issue of representing knowledge with signs within a knowledge creative process that results into innovations. In fact, it is argued that the constant effort of replacing one sign with another, a metal image with a symbol and an author with letters results into innovations. In that approach, the present exploration discusses that a signified and a signification are neither the same nor totally distinct (Derrida, 1974). Thus, there is always the distance and the diversion of meaning that is needed to be

followed so as to de-construct, re-assemble and generate new knowledge that translates into innovations. This linguistically constructed process of new knowledge emerges from inside an unplanned and an inconceivable symbolic lingua reality that is momentary and encloses manifold unspoken contradictions, interruptions and paradoxes within KIFs. In that way, it is underlined that language creates, misleads, hides and misconceives objects, feelings and ideas while it vitally and internally (beyond individuals' consciousness and will) imposes the extraction of a conclusiveness without being able to claim any definite boundary of knowledge. Hence, language creates knowledge and simultaneously retains an ambiguity of its meanings. Consequently, it is proposed that could have been extremely important to investigators, if future research would empirically explore how language actually directs to staff' misconceptions and interpretations of new meanings within a knowledge creative process that transforms into new products.

Additionally, the current work draws from literature of KIFs and examines the linguistic configuration of knowledge that transforms into innovations. Thus, it is argued that a KIF constitutes of manifold linguistically constructed environments in which individuals contradict, challenge and interconnect ideas and significations. Specifically, the individuals of KIFs hold a constantly self-escaped language and a diversified freedom of speech to manifest their own unique meanings as a representational organizational reality. Moreover, the research points out that knowledge creation, sharing and its novel application emerge almost unintentionally from language while individuals are occupied (strive) to establish conceptual agreements within KIFs. In other words, individuals are driven, each time, from an esoteric form of language's construction that paraphrases and re-creates past meanings into new perceptions of reality. In addition, the paper shows that KIFs resemble to a nomadic kind of organizations in which order and chaos are endemic characteristics of organizational reality (Styhre, 2001; Fischer, 1999; Ilipinar et al., 2011). In other words, individuals'

coalitions emerge through a linguistic interaction as a process of knowledge creation rather than imposed on them. Hence, it is not said that everything goes and KIFs lack a total control of individuals' actions. Instead, it is emphasized a linguistic kind of (statement) organizational life which encourages a perpetually tentative experience of individuals in between stability and change. It holds a fundamentally unpredictable existence and moves through multi-layered glossally constructed contradictions and discontinuations. Thus, an unavoidable glossal formulation of new knowledge decomposes existent thinking and re-states a new view (order) of reality within KIFs. Moreover, the paper supports that language enforces individuals of KIFs to reach partially produced and locally captured new meanings each time. Also, knowledge creation, its sharing and its novel implementation follow a process that arbitrary supplements of significations come on their own constantly to reshape the thinking of individuals, their understanding and their organizational intervention within KIFs (Derrida, 1967, 1974, 1988). Consequently, any novel created knowledge becomes a renewed forgery of reality, it proclaims and miscarries already its future elements since it constantly substitutes expected connotations with unintentionally added concepts and feelings. Hence, any kind of new constructed knowledge refers to a plural and a multi-diverse relation between represented and representation, signifier and signification, death and life within KIFs. And, it endlessly follows a multitude of a linguistically manifested being and acting that reside in all aspects of organizational life. Taking the above into perspective, it is suggested that a future could examine the application of Information Technology (IT) as part of a linguistic process that creates knowledge that transmutes into innovations within KIFs. As a result, it would be possible to examine how individuals use IT to symbolically manifest meanings and multi-diverse linguistic realities that shape knowledge creation, sharing and its novel implementation.

Overall, the paper's thesis is based on

Derrida's theory, and it stresses a linguistically based creation of knowledge that translates into innovations. In that way, it is claimed that knowledge creation, sharing and its novel implementation do not count on stable and standardized language. Instead, they are manifold languages and codes of meanings that interweave and reconstruct new knowledge that translates into innovations within KIFs. Moreover, it is argued that the constant scribed and codified effort of individuals to record themselves, others and objects unfolds unpredictably and creates knowledge within KIFs. Thus, new knowledge, its sharing and its implementation enclose each time unpredictable significations of words, wishes, thoughts, objects, processes and actions. Additionally, the paper argues the manifold linguistic categories, views and resources that are used in the construction of innovations within KIFs. Consequently, individuals of KIFs find constantly themselves into an unexpected linguistically formulated reality while they believe to control and manufacture unique products. Individuals, through the phonographic or pictographic recall of language, manifest a knowledge that constantly stands on the verge between chaos and order. Also, individuals participate in an intensive game and an experimentation of language that lacks any origin and end. Hence, individuals invent, omit and add arbitrary and unintentional semantics of meanings that escape their realization and constantly reassign new knowledge and innovations within KIFs. In addition, the paper argues that its current propositions should be used to further enquiry of theory and language (Boje, 2011a). In other words, it is important that the presented insights be subjects of new investigation within organizational theory.

Bibliography

1. Alvesson M (1995) *Cultural perspectives on organizations*, CUP Archive.
2. Alvesson M (2000) Social identity and the problem of Loyalty in knowledge intensive firms. *Journal of management studies*, 37(8): 1101-1123.
3. Alvesson M and Robertson, M, Swan J (2001). The Best and the Brightest: The role of elite identity in Knowledge-intensive companies, paper presented at CMS conference, available at: <http://www.Management.ac.nz> (12/3/2010)
4. Anderson H and Goolishian H (1992). The client is the expert: A not-knowing approach to therapy. In McNamee S and Gergen K (Eds.), *Social construction and the therapeutic process*, 25-39.
5. Barrett FJ (1988) Creativity and Improvisation in Jazz and Organizations: Implications for Organizational Learning. *Organization Science* 9(5): 605-625.
6. Bakhtin MM (1981) *THE DIALOGIC IMAGINATION*, USA: University Texas Press.
7. Brown JS and Duguid P (1998) Organizing knowledge. *California management review* 40(3): 90-111.
8. Burrell G (1997) *Pandemonium: Towards a retro-organization theory*, London: Sage.
9. Baudrillard J (1988) *Simulacra and simulations*. In: Rivkin J and Ryan M (2eds) *Literacy Theory: An anthology*. Australia: Blackwell Publications, 166-184.
10. Beech N, Cairns G and Montuori A (2001) Adjusting the granularity of management perception and action. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry* 1(3): 30.
11. Bjørkeng K, Clegg S, Pitsis T (2009) Becoming (a) practice. *Management Learning* 1;40(2):145-59.
12. Berg O P (1989) POSTMODERN MANAGEMENT? FROM FACTS TO FICTION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 5(3):201-217.
13. Blackman D and Imas M (2011) Transgressive knowledge creation in entrepreneurship. *Handbook of Research on New Venture Creation*: 99.
14. Brown AD, Kornberger M, Clegg SR and Carter C (2010) Invisible walls" and "silent hierarchies": A case study of power relations in an architecture firm. *Human relations* 63(4):525-549.

15. Brown RH (1990) Rhetoric, textuality and the postmodern turn in Sociological theory. *Sociological theory* 8(2): 188-197.
16. Boje DM (1995) Stories of The Storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as "Tamara-Land". *Academy of Management Journal* 38(4): 997-1035.
17. Boje DM (2003) Using narrative and telling stories. In: Holman, D. and Thorpe, R. (eds) *Management and language*. London: Sage Publications, 41-53.
18. Boje, DM and Jorgensen KM (2008). Deconstructing the narrative Story Duality-CONSTRUCTING A SPACE FOR ETHICS. Presented in the symposium of Philosophy and Political Economy, University of Leicester, 14-16 May
19. Boje DM (2011a) Theorizing after the Postmodern, Challenges and Controversies in Management Research: 389-403.
20. Boje DM (2011b) *Storytelling and the future of organizations: An antenarrative handbook*. Routledge
21. Boland RJ and Tenkasi RV (1995) Perspective making and perspective taking in communities of knowing. *Organization science* 6(4): 350-372.
22. Brown SL and Eisenhardt KM (1997) The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations. *Administrative science quarterly* :1-34.
23. Chia R (1996) The Problem of Reflexivity in Organizational Research: Towards a Postmodern Science of Organization. *Organization* 31(4): 31-59.
24. Chia R (2001) *Foundations of Management Knowledge: Assumptions and Limitations*. University of Exeter, School of Business and Economics.
25. Clegg SR, Kornberger M and Rhodes C (2004) Noise, Parasites and Translations. Theory and Practice in Management Consulting. *Management Learning* 35 (1):31-44.
26. Clegg S R, Kornberger M and Rhodes C (2005) Learning/Becoming/Organizing. *Organization* 12(2): 147-167.
27. Clegg S R, Rhodes C and Kornberger M (2007) Desperately Seeking Legitimacy: Organizational Identity and Emerging Industries. *Organization Studies* 28(4): 495-513.
28. Cook SD and Brown JS (1999) Bridging epistemologies: The generative dance between organizational knowledge and organizational knowing. *Organization science* 10(4): 381-400.
29. Cross R and Prusak L (2002) The people who make organizations go-or stop. *Harvard Business Review* 80(6): 105-112.
30. Cooper R and Burrell B (1988) Modernism, postmodernism and organizational analysis: an introduction. *Organization Studies*, 9: 91-112
31. Cunha MP, Clegg SR and Kamoche K (2012) Improvisation as "real time foresight". *Futures* 44(3): 265-272.
32. Davenport TH, Prusak L and Wilson HJ (2003) Who's bringing you hot ideas (and how are you responding)? *Harvard Business Review* 81(2): 58-65.
33. Deetz S (1992) Disciplinary Power in the Modern Corporation. In: Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (eds) *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage.
34. Derrida J (1967) *writing and Difference*, Great Britain: Routledge.
35. Derrida J (1981) *DISSEMINATION*, Great Britain: Athlone Press Ltd.
36. Derrida J (1974) *OF GRAMMATOLOGY*, USA: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
37. Derrida J (1988) *Limited Inc*, USA: Northwestern University Press.
38. Derrida J (1987) *THE POST CARD: From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*, London: The University of Chicago Press.
39. Derrida J (2007) *Psyche*, Stanford California: Stanford University Press.

40. Deleuze G (1994) *Difference and repetition*. London: The Athlone Press.
41. Deleuze G and Guattari F (1983) *Anti-Oedipus: Schizophrenia and Capitalism*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
42. Deleuze G (2001) *Pure Immanence*. NY:Urzone Inc.
43. Drucker PF (1988) The coming of the new organization. *Harvard Business Review*: 1-11.
44. Dougherty D (1992) Interpretive barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization science* 3(2):179-202.
45. Edvinsson L and Malone MS (1997) Intellectual Capital: Realizing Your Company's True Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower.
46. Fischer MM (1999) Emergent forms of life: Anthropologies of late or postmodernities. *Annual Review of Anthropology*: 455-478.
47. Fox NJ (2002) *Refracting health: Deleuze, Guattari and body/self*. Health ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
48. Fleming P and Spicer A (2003) Working at a cynical distance: implications for power, subjectivity and resistance. *Organization*, 10 (1):157- 179.
49. Gergen KJ and Thatchenkery TJ (1996) Organization science as social construction: Postmodern potentials. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 32(4): 356-377.
50. Gergen KJ (2001) Psychological Science in a Postmodern Context. *American Psychologist* 56: 803-813.
51. Hamel G (1996) *Strategy as revolution*. *Harvard Business Review* :69-71.
52. Hamel G (2001) Revolution vs Evolution: You need both. *Harvard Business Review* 79(5): 150-159.
53. Hassard J (1994) Postmodern organizational analysis: Toward a conceptual framework. *Journal of Management Studies* 31(3):303-324.
54. Hatch MJ (1999) Exploring the empty spaces of organizing: How improvisational jazz helps redescribe organizational structure. *Organization Studies* 20(1): 75-100.
55. Hansen MT, Nohria N and Tierney T (2000) What's Your Strategy for Managing Knowledge?. *Harvard Business Review*: 105-116.
56. Hansen H, Barry D, Boje D and Hatch MJ (2007) Truth or Consequences: An improvised collective story construction. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 16(2): 112-126.
57. Heidegger M (1962) Being and time, trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson.
58. Hargardon A (1988) Firms as Knowledge Brokers: Lessons in pursuing continuous innovations. *California Management Review* 40(3): 209-227.
59. Ilipinar G Johnston WJ Montaña J Spender JC and Truex DP (2011) Design thinking in the postmodern organization. *Humanistic Management Network, Research Paper Series*: 14-6.
60. Jeanes EL (2006) Resisting Creativity, Creating the New': A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 15(2): 127-134.
61. Jeffcutt P and Thomas M (1998) Organization, information and computation. *Organization* 5(3): 397-423.
62. Kamoche KM, Cunha MP and Cunha JVD (2003) Towards a theory of organizational improvisation: Looking beyond the jazz metaphor. *Journal of Management Studies* 40(8): 2023-2051.
63. Koschmann T (1999) Toward a dialogic theory of learning: Bakhtin's contribution to understanding learning in settings of collaboration. Paper presented at the *conference on Computer support for collaborative learning*, International Society of the Learning Sciences.

64. Kroeze JH (2012) Postmodernism, interpretivism, and formal ontologies. In Mora M, Gelman, O, Steenkamp, A, Raisinghani, MS (eds) *Research Methodologies, Innovations and Philosophies in Software Systems Engineering and Information Systems. Information Science Reference, Hershey, PA*, 43-62.
65. Kilduff M and Mehra A (1997) Postmodernism and organizational research. *Academy of Management Review* 22(2): 453-481.
66. Kunda, G (1992) *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech organization*, Temple University Press: Philadelphia.
67. Knights, D and McCabe D (2003) *Organization and innovation*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
68. Kärreman D and Alvesson M (2004) Cages in tandem: Management control, social identity, and identification in a knowledge-intensive firm. *Organization* 11(1): 149-175.
69. Von Krogh G, Nonaka I and Aben M (2001) Making the most of your company's knowledge: a strategic framework. *Long range planning* 34(4): 421-439.
70. Kornberger M and Clegg S (2003) The architecture of Complexity. *Culture and Organization* 9(2): 75-91.
71. Kornberger M, Clegg SR and Carter C (2006) Rethinking the polyphonic organization: Managing as discursive practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 22(1): 3-30.
72. Kosmala K (2005) Insights from Ricoeur' hermeneutics on best practice in professional service firms: On perpetual myth creation?. *Qualitative Sociology Review* 1(1): 31-50.
73. Law J (2002) Objects and Spaces. *Theory, Culture and Society* 19(5):91-105.
74. Law J (2000) On the Subject of the Object. *Configurations* 8:1-29.
75. Lyotard JF (1984) *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (Vol. 10): U of Minnesota Press.
76. Latour B (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*. USA: Harvard University Press.
77. Lamproulis D, (2007) *In use cultural values enhance the knowledge processes of creation, transfer and implementation that lead to innovation: the over-creating knowledge theory*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK.
78. Nonaka I and Takeuchi H (1995) *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*: Oxford university press .
79. Nonaka I, Toyama R and Konno N (2000) SECI, Ba and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long range planning* 33(1): 5-34.
80. Nietzsche F (1968) *The will to power*. New York: Vintage Books.
81. Nietzsche F (1990) *Philosophy and truth: Selections from Nietzsche's notebooks of the early 1870s*. New Jersey: Humanities Press
82. O'Reilly CA and Tushman ML (2008) *Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma*. *Research in orKornberger, M and Clegg, S. (2003). The architecture of Complexity. Culture and Organization, 9 (2), pp. 75-91. Organizational behavior* 28: 185-206.
83. Prusak L and Cohen D (2001) How to invest in social capital. *Harvard business review* 79(6): 86-93.
84. Peters, TJ, Waterman RH and Jones I (1982) *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*.
85. Peters M (1999) (Posts-) modernism and structuralism: affinities and theoretical innovations. *Sociological Research Online* 4(3)
86. Pfeffer J and Sutton RI (1999) Knowing "what" to do is not enough: Turning knowledge into action. *California management review* 42(1): 83-108.

87. Quinn JB, Anderson P and Finkelstein S (1996) Making the most of the best. *Harvard Business Review*: 71-80.
88. Reed, M. I. (1993). Organizations and Modernity: Continuity and Discontinuity in Organization Theory. In: Hassard J, Parker M (eds) Postmodernism and Organizations. London: Sage, 148-163.
89. Robertson M, Scarborough H and Swan J (2003) Knowledge Creation in Professional Service Firms: Institutional Effects. *Organization Studies* 24 (6): 831-857.
90. Robertson M and Swan J (2003) Control - what control? Culture and ambiguity within a knowledge intensive firm. *Journal of Management Studies* 40: 831-58.
91. Starbuck WH (1992) Learning by knowledge-intensive firms, *Journal of management Studies* 29(6): 713-740.
92. Steinberg, A (2005) Emergent knowledge dynamics in innovation: exploring e-business entrepreneurship after the dotcom crash, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), UK.
93. Swart J and Kinnie N (2003) Sharing knowledge in knowledge-intensive firms. *Human resource management journal* 13(2): 60-75.
94. Scarbrough, H., Robertson, M., Nicolini, D., Swan, J. (2007). Organizational learning, knowledge and capabilities. *Management Learning*, 38 (3), 259-264.
95. Sewell G (2005) Nice Work: Rethinking management control in an era of knowledge work. *Organization* 12(5): 685-704.
96. Stephens M (1991) Do Modernist Researchers know what Postmodern Users' Want?. In: Australasian Transport Research Forum, 16th, 1991, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia (Vol. 16, No. Part 1).
97. Styhre A (2001) The nomadic organization: The postmodern organization of becoming. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry* 1(4).
98. Sveiby KE (1996) Transfer of knowledge and the information processing professions. *European Management Journal* 14(4): 379-388.
99. Sorensen BM (2005) Immaculate Defecation: Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in Organization Theory. *Sociological Review* 53 (1): 120-133.
100. Sørensen BM (2006) Identity sniping: Innovation, imagination and the body. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 15(2): 135-142.
101. Tran, V (2004) The Influence of Emotions on Decision-Making Processes In Management Teams. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Geneva, Geneva.
102. Tsoukas H (1996) The firm as a distributed knowledge system: a constructionist approach. *Strategic management journal* 17(S2): 11-25.
103. Tsoukas H and Chia R (2002) On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational change. *Organization science*, 13(5): 567-582.
104. Tenkasi RV and Boland Jr RJ (1996) Exploring knowledge diversity in knowledge intensive firms: a new role for information systems. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9(1): 79-91.
105. Weick KE (1995) *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3). Sage.
106. Willmott H (1993) Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of management studies* 30(4): 515-552.
107. Wittgenstein L (1972) *PHILOSOPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS*, Oxford: Blackwell Ltd.
108. Zack MH (1999) Developing a knowledge strategy. *California management review* 41(3): 125-145.