

Call for Papers

MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL (Mi)

"Knowledge management challenged by new "objects" of the 21st century management".

New deadline for submission: January 3, 2022, 2021

Guest Editors

- **Pascal Lievre** — IAE Clermont Auvergne, CleRMa EA 3849, Université Clermont Auvergne, France
- **Jean-Philippe Bootz** — EM Strasbourg Business School, Université de Strasbourg, HuManiS UR 7308, France
- **Etienne Wenger-Trayner** — Co- founder of Social Learning Lab, Portugal

The 21st century is seeing the emergence of a large number of new "objects" of all kinds within organizations, between organizations and beyond organizations. These new objects are emerging on different continents, in Europe, the United States and Asia, in emerging countries and in countries with strong industrial traditions. New practices, both formal and informal, new management tools and devices, new technologies, but also new philosophies of organization and society are emerging and are profoundly changing the managerial landscape.

It is a Prévert-style list that could be established by naming them in alphabetical order: After Work, Aigo Café, Big Data, Block Chain, Blue Economy, Club Open Innovation, Coaching, Creative Community, Epistemic Community, Community of Practice, Innovation Community, Community of Interest, Virtual Communities, Citizen Climate Convention, Deep Learning, Design Thinking, Digitalization, Hybrid Forum, Collaborative Economy, Circular Economy, Liberated Enterprise, Co-Working Space, Community Management, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Co-Development Group, Hackathon, Hackerspaces/Makerspaces, C/K Model, Jugaad Innovation, Internet of Things, Learning Expedition, Living Lab, Fab-Lab, Middle Ground, Local Currency, Open Lab, Open Source, Cognitive Platform, Corporate Social Network, Accountability, KM Service, Smart City, Third Location, Ecological, Wiki ... In addition, many events are emerging where employees from different institutions of all kinds, public and private, organize regular exchanges on the failures and successes of entrepreneurs, managers who lead innovative actions.

We are thus seeing the emergence of new areas of collaboration that challenge the traditional boundaries of organizations and their management modes (Bootz, 2015; Cohendet et al., 2006; Cohendet et al., 2010; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002). Moreover, the exponential growth of uses related to new digital technologies is leading to profound changes whose effects are difficult to predict in the long term. Finally, new organizational philosophies are also emerging and laying the seeds for fundamental changes.

At the same time, new paradigmatic and theoretical frameworks emerge from the 1990s to account for a historical evolution of the capitalist economy: from an economy of mass production (1950-1975) to an economy of quality (1975-1990) towards a knowledge economy (Foray, 2004). An evolution of the economy, but also of the related modes of management, since each stage corresponds to a new organization of the firm that refers to a specific form of management (Cohendet, Simon, 2011; Lièvre, Coutarel, 2012). This evolution translates into the transition from an industrial society based on capital and labour to a post-industrial society where the main resource is knowledge (Drucker, 1996). The deeply transformed firm becomes a knowledge processor (Cohendet, Llerena, 1999) and even an idea processor (Cohendet, Simon, 2017). Management based on command and control is increasingly based on support and trust towards employees (Hamel, 2008). A new management paradigm is emerging according to Clark and Clegg (2000).

Proposals are made to radically distinguish this knowledge economy from an industrial economy (Foray, 2011). Intangible capital that exceeds tangible capital in the economic growth of countries, a phenomenon that points to the place that knowledge holds in value creation. A socio-technical break with the appearance of the computer and remote communication via the web that modifies the relationship to knowledge, in terms of accessibility and cost, but also our relationship to time and space. As Michel Serres (2009) expresses it, this revolution is equivalent to the one we have experienced with the revolution of writing, and then that of printing. A new rule of the game for the company is imposed, where innovation is the necessary passage to hold its competitive position. Every firm, whatever its size and sector, is obliged to submit to a regime of intensive innovation (Eisenhardt and Brown, 1998; Hatchuel and Weil, 1999; Amin and Cohendet, 2003; Foray, 2009) that will require the initiation of creative knowledge spirals (Nonaka, Takeuchi, 1996). More broadly, all of the organization's activities become knowledge-intensive, challenging existing knowledge and skills and forcing actors to engage in a process of generalized knowledge expansion. Finally, knowledge expansion processes are not only based on scientific knowledge and knowledge from Research and Development, but also on experiential knowledge acquired by operators, knowledge that has the particularity of being fundamentally implicit. It is the ability for organizations to combine these two such different types of knowledge that will become a critical capacity (Amin, Cohendet, 2003; Foray, 2009).

It is the capacity of organizations to develop learning coordination that breaks away from project coordination that is at stake. This capacity is being tested in order to cope with extreme events such as the Covid-19 epidemic, but also structurally via the ecological transition as a response to the anthropocene, as a new stage in the geological development of the earth (Bonneuil, Fressoz, 2013).

A new discipline is emerging in management sciences: knowledge management. Inexistent in the 1990s, today it represents more than 7000 articles in the field of management alone. Precisely, 7163 articles are listed in the SCOPUS database (Lièvre, Landivar, 2018). Twenty-seven new specialized journals will emerge over the period, some of which are already becoming references in the academic literature: Journal of Knowledge Management, Journal of Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management Research and Practice, The Learning Organisation... (2017, Serenkos, Bontis).

Indeed, the theoretical foundations are extremely diverse in relation to the complexity of this object of knowledge and the variety of disciplines that are mobilized in support. The semiotic triangle

(Shannon, Barthes, Eco) where knowledge is a contextualized signifying message that is transmitted to a receiver will be the crucible of a patrimonial approach to knowledge in organizations (for example: Ermine, 1996, 2017). The epistemological work of the chemist Michael Polyani (1962) documenting the relationship between the implicit characteristics of personal knowledge and scientific knowledge in its explicit component will constitute the theoretical basis for the distinction of knowledge at the heart of the knowledge conversion process in the innovative Japanese firm; this is the SECI model of Nonaka and Takeuchi (1996). The work of economists since Machlup (1980), which divides information and knowledge and in which economic knowledge appears as a good that is difficult to control, non-rivalrous in use and cumulative, will make it necessary to construct a new theoretical framework for the knowledge economy (Foray, 2009). Knowledge is also understood as fundamentally a process of learning in situation, a process of "legitimate peripheral participation" (Lave, Wenger, 1992) that will give rise to the development of work on communities (Wenger, 1998; Amin, Cohendet, 2004; Amin, Roberts, 2008). The work of Herbert Simon (1979) was to be extended and surpassed with C/K theory by developing an axiomatic of design reasoning by proposing a partition between non-logical propositions (ideas) and logical propositions (knowledge) (Hatchuel, Le Masson, Weill, 2017.).

The field of knowledge management has thus undergone massive development in recent years, but the heterogeneity of the theoretical approaches mentioned above makes it difficult to construct a unified and stabilized conceptual framework (Easterby-Smith and Lyles 2003; Ferrary and Pesqueux 2006; Jashapara 2010; Dibiaggio and Meschi 2010; Schwartz and Te'eni, 2011). Theoretical and empirical investigative efforts (Marques and Simon, 2006) need to be continued to enable a universally accepted comprehensive approach (Anand and Singh, 2011). Partitions of the field are the subject of numerous investigations (Blacker, 1995; Shariq, 1997; Liebowitz 1999; Alavi, Leidner, 2001; Swan, Scarbrouh, 2001; Easterby-Smith & Lyles, 2003; Argote, McEvily, Reagans, 2003; Nonaka, Peltokorpi, 2006; Heisig, 2009; Serenko et al, 2009; Curado et al. 2011; Ragab and Arisha 2013; Ribièrè and Walter 2013; Serenko 2013; Walter and Ribièrè 2013; Serenko and Dumay 2015; Syed, Murray, Hislop, Mouzoughi 2018). There are about a hundred proposals for structuring the field (Lièvre, Merour, 2019). For example, the GECSO community has developed a matrix structuring of the field by combining online research programs and columnar archetypal operations (Paraponaris, Ermine, Guittard, Lièvre, 2012). Easterby-Smith and Lyles (2011), in a handbook published by Wiley, propose to partition the field of knowledge management by distinguishing four dials: a) work from March (1991), then Argyris and Schon (1997) on organizational learning, which will develop today with Argote (2012) but also in another direction with Cook and Brown (1990), Lave and Wenger (1991), b) the work around Senge (1991) in terms of learning organization, c) the relationship between economists such as Hayek, Penrose, Nelson and Winter and management researchers such as Nonaka and Von Krogh, and d) finally, work centered on knowledge management practices such as Alavi and Leidner (2001); Hansen, Nohria, Terney (1999).

The purpose of this thematic issue of the journal *Management International* is, on the one hand, to determine the extent to which the paradigm of the knowledge economy and/or the field of knowledge management constitute relevant theoretical frameworks to account for these new "objects": practice, tool, device, philosophy. On the other hand, it is a question of exploring the impact of the emergence of these new "objects" on the evolution of this new paradigm and the related theoretical productions. Contributions dealing more globally with the structuring of this

new paradigm from a conceptual point of view but also from an epistemological point of view will also find their place in this special issue.

Paper proposals should be sent by email to jean-philippe.bootz@em-strasbourg.eu. They must comply with the publication standards of Management International.

This call for papers follows the AGECSO conference held in Clermont-Ferrand on 18-19-20-21 June 2019, organized by the CleRMA (Clermont Recherche Management), University Clermont Auvergne. This symposium was held at IAE Clermont Auvergne, Groupe ESC Clermont and within Michelin R&D. This conference also benefited from the support of the ACTé laboratory, the Open Lab Exploration Innovation, the PSDR 4 Inventer (INRA & AURA) and Clermont Auvergne Métropole.

References :

- Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS quarterly*, 107-136.
- Amin, A., Cohendet, P. (2004). *Architectures of knowledge. Firms, capabilities and communities*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Anand, A., Singh, M. (2011), « Understanding Knowledge Management: A Literature Review ». *International Journal of Engineering Science and Technology*, vol. 3, n° 2, pp. 926-939.
- Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes. *Management science*, 49(4), 571-582.
- Blacker, F. (1995). Knowledge, Work and Organ Overview and Interpretation. *Organization Studies*, 16(6).
- Clark, T., Clegg S., (2000), Management paradigms for the new millenium, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(1), 45-64.
- Cohendet P., Créplet F., Dupouet O. (2006), *La gestion des connaissances; firmes et communautés de savoir*, Economica.
- Cohendet P., Roberts J., Simon L. (2010), « Créer, implanter et gérer des communautés de pratique », *Gestion*, vol.35, n°4, p. 31-35.
- Cohendet, P., & Llerena, P. (1999). La conception de la firme comme processeur de connaissances. *Revue d'économie industrielle*, 88(1), 211-235.
- Cohendet, P., & Simon, L. (2017), Concepts and models of innovation, in Bathelt et alii, *The Elgar Companion to Innovation and Knowledge Creation*, Edward Elgar.
- Curado, C., Oliveira, M., Macada A.C.G. (2011), « Mapping knowledge management authoring patterns and practices », *African Journal of Business Management*, vol. 5, n°22, pp. 9137-9153.
- Dibiaggio, L., Meschi, P.X. (2010), *Le Management dans l'Economie de la Connaissance*, Pearson Education.
- Easterby-Smith, Lyles M.A. (2011), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Wiley.
- Ermine, J. L. (1996). *Les systèmes de connaissances*. Hermès.
- Ermine J.L. (2018), *Knowledge Management: The creative loop*, ISTE Wiley.
- Ferrary, M., Pesqueux, Y. (2006), *Management de la Connaissance: Knowledge Management, Apprentissage Organisationnel et Société de la Connaissance*, Economica.
- Foray D. (2004), *The economics of knowledge*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Foray D. (2009), *L'économie de la connaissance*, Paris, La Découverte, « Repères ».
- Foray D., Gault F. (2003), *Measuring Knowledge Management in the Business Sector*, OCDE, Paris.
- Garvin, D.A., Edmondson A.C, Gino F. (2008), « Is yours a learning organization ? » *Harvard Business Review*. march.

- Hamel G., 2018, *La fin du management*, Edition Vuibert.
- Hansen, M., Nohria, N., & Tierney, T. (1999). What's your strategy for knowledge management. *Harvard Business Review*, 77(2), 106-116.
- Hatchuel, A., Le Masson, P., & Weil, B. (2017). CK theory: modelling creative thinking and its impact on research. In *Creativity, Design Thinking and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 169-183). Springer, Singapore.
- Hatchuel A., Weil B. (1999), « Design-oriented organisations, towards a unified theory of design activities », *6th International Product Development Management Conference*, Cambridge, UK, Churchill College, 5-6th July, pp. 1-28.
- Heisig, P. (2009), « Harmonisation of knowledge management — comparing 160 KM frameworks around the globe », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 13, n° 4, pp. 4-31.
- Jashapara, D.A. (2010), *Knowledge Management: An Integrated Approach 2e éd.*, Financial Times, Prentice Hall.
- Kendrick J.W. (1994), « Total capital and economic growth », *Atlantic Economic Journal*, vol.22, n° 1, mars, p. 1-18.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1992). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral cognition*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Liebowitz, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Knowledge management handbook*. CRC Press.
- Lièvre P., Coutarel F., (2013), Sciences de gestion et ergonomie : un dialogue nécessaire dans le cadre d'une économie de la connaissance, *Economie et Société*, Série « Economie de l'entreprise », vol. 1, n°22, pp. 123-146.
- Lièvre P., Landivar D., (2018), Etat d'avancement du Projet Emergence Cap 20-25 UCA autour de la structuration du management des connaissances, *XIème Colloque GECSO-FNEGE*, Cité Internationale Universitaire de Paris, 17-19 mai.
- Lièvre P., Méroux E., *Etat des travaux proposant une structuration du champ du KM*, Document Interne, Projet Emergence CAP-20-25, CleRMA, ACTé, INRA, Université Clermont Auvergne.
- Machlup F., 1980, *Knowledge: Its Creation, Distribution, and Economic Significance*. Volume I: Knowledge and Knowledge Production. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lundvall, B.-Å., P. Nielsen (1999), « Competition and transformation in the learning economy — the Danish case », *Revue d'Economie Industrielle* vol. 88, pp. 67-90.
- Marques, D., Simon, F. (2006), « The Effect of Knowledge Management Practices on Firm Performance », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 10, n°3, pp.143-156.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Nonaka, I., & Peltokorpi, V. (2006). Objectivity and subjectivity in knowledge management: a review of 20 top articles. *Knowledge and process management*, 13(2), 73-82.
- Paraponaris, C., Ermine, J. L., Guittard, C., & Lièvre, P. (2012). Knowledge management in a French research community: a case study of GeCSO congress. *VINE*, 42(3-4), 302-320
- Polanyi M. (1966), *The Tacit Dimension*, Doubleday, New York.
- Powel W.W., Snellman K., (2004), « The knowledge economy », *American Review of Sociology*, vol. 30, pp. 199-220.
- Ragab, M., Arisha, A. (2013), « Knowledge Management and Measurement: A Critical Review », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 17, n° 6, pp 873-901
- Rivière, V., Walter, C. (2013), « 10 years of KM theory and practices », *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, vol. 11, n°1, pp. 4-9.
- Schwartz D., Te'eni D. (2011). *Encyclopedia of knowledge management*, Hershey: Information Science Reference.

- Serenko, A. (2013), « Meta-analysis of Scientometric Research of Knowledge Management : Discovering the Identity of the Discipline », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol 17, n° 5, pp. 773-812.
- Serenko, A., Bontis, N. Grant, J. (2009), « A scientometric analysis of the Proceedings of the McMaster World Congress on the Management of Intellectual Capital and Innovation for the 1996-2008 period », *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 10, n° 1, pp. 8-21.
- Serenko, A. and Bontis, N. (2017), « Global ranking of knowledge management and intellectual capital academic journals: 2017 update », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 21 n°. 3, pp. 675-692.
- Serenko, A., Dumay, J. (2015), « Citation classics published in Knowledge Management Journals, Part I: articles and their characteristics », *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 19, n° 2, pp. 401-431.
- Shariq, S. Z. (1997). Knowledge management: an emerging discipline. *Journal of knowledge management*, 1(1), 75-82.
- Simon H.A., “*Models of Thought*”, New haven and London, Yale University Press, 1979.
- Swan, J., & Scarbrough, H. (2001). Knowledge management: Concepts and controversies. *Journal of management studies*, 38(7), 913-921.
- Syed, J., Murray, P. A., Hislop, D., & Mouzoughi, Y. (Eds.). (2018). *The Palgrave handbook of knowledge management*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Walter, C., Ribière, V. (2013), « A citation and co-citation analysis of 10 years of KM theory and practices », *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, vol. 11, n°3, pp. 221–229.
- Wenger E. (1998), *Communities of Practice : Learning, Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge, MA : Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R., Snyder, W.M. (2002), *Cultivating Communities of Practice*, McGraw-Hill.
- Wolfe, M. (2003), « Mapping the field: knowledge management », *Canadian Journal of Communication*, vol. 28 n° 1, pp. 85-109.