

# Exploring How Tacit Knowledge and Implicit Attention Affect the Innovation Process

Mohammed Alsaigh<sup>1,\*</sup> and May Taibah<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>KAU MIS Department, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

<sup>2</sup>ALJ Group, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

**Abstract:** People when take part in the innovation process enforce tacit knowledge unintentionally, they look for solutions through the thorough the unconscious process (Okuyama, 2017). However, the awareness and attention from people related to changes in the business surrounding them is an essence of innovation (Yadav et al., 2007). People are unable to deal with every problem they face, hence they must tend to select specific ones for giving their attention to (Ocasio, 1997).

This research undertakes to merge the knowledge creation theory (Nonaka, 1994) and the attention-based view theory (Ocasio, 1997) for the purpose of exploring the relationship among tacit knowledge and implicit attention. Additionally, the study attempts to determine the way this relationship influence the knowledge creation in the innovation process. Furthermore, this research attempt to create a theory related to how individual's tacit knowledge influences their attention to deal with specific issues as well as their distinctive solutions. Last but not the least, the study concludes with the knowledge regarding the way the tacit knowledge combine with implicit focus and affects the selection of problems and solutions in each of the innovation degree.

**Keywords:** Innovation, Knowledge management, Tacit knowledge, Attention-based view theory, Knowledge creation theory.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The review of literature reveals the discussion of tacit knowledge as a whole, together with its two attributes: technical and cognitive. There are few number of research studies on the relationship between tacit knowledge and the innovation process. Besides, there is a limited studies available on the relationship between attention and innovation.

The knowledge of people who take part in the innovation process is essential to its development (Chalmers & Balan-Vnuuk, 2013). The innovation process possesses a high degree of knowledge sharing, nearly all this knowledge is tacit (Mirvis et al., 2016). The tacit knowledge of people leads to new creations ,as their preferences regarding what to have concentration on and what to disregard influences the direction of an organization )Yadav et al., 2007). The basis of selection regarding towards focus and disregard or ignore is linked to the attention of people.

Knowledge advent within businesses starts with the sharing of tacit knowledge between the participants inside the process of creating a brand-new services or products (Von Krogh et al., 2000). The procedure of knowledge creation begins with the interplay between tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Lam, 2000).

Tacit knowledge sharing among two distinct individuals in a company is crucial in accomplishing a successful innovation (Seidler-de Alwis & Hartmann, 2008). The model of knowledge conversion, specifically externalization and internalization, is mainly critical in the innovation manner.

Ocasio (1997) defines the term attention as one that refers to the interpretation, encoding, and focusing of effort and time on choices of problems and their solutions.

The attention-based view theory is primarily based on issues and answers, in which issues are the collection of problems related to circumstances, possibilities, as well as threats which individuals recognize inside the surroundings around them. While, the answers refers to the gathering of moves, motion alternatives, proposals, projects, applications, routines, and methods used in the undertaking of manipulating or resolving issues (Ocasio, 1997).

Implicit attention is a type of managerial attention (Kumar & Demir, 2013), and is associated with the externalization system (Nonaka, 1994). Tacit knowledge resides in person's minds, whilst implicit attention occurs when necessary (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

In order to answer this research question, authors have adopted a qualitative research methodology in order to explore how individuals experienced, built, and interpreted the world across them via their social interactions with others (Tuli, 2010).This research is based on two complementary theoretical techniques: the knowledge creation theory of Nonaka (1994) and the attention-based view theory of Ocasio

\*Address correspondence to this author at the KAU MIS Department, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, oalsaigh@kau.edu.sa

(1997). In doing so, the relationship among tacit knowledge and implicit attention is explored. This relationship is examined within the phases of the innovation process.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the ever-changing and aggressive markets these days, organizations are moving towards knowledge control and innovation to stay competitive. Innovation is affected by understanding and depends extraordinarily on tacit knowledge. Besides, attention, is amongst other influences affecting innovation as it calls for the attention of people who are responsible for it (Yadav et al., 2007). These arguments motivated the researcher to explore this research question:

What is the connection between tacit knowledge generated by personal experience and implicit attention within the innovation procedure?

Polanyi (1966) is the establishing father of the concept of tacit knowledge and represented the essence of tacit knowledge as “We know more than we can tell,” (Polanyi, 1966, p. 4). According to Lam (2000) tacit knowledge is the origin of human knowledge and learning, through social interaction. Bhardwaj and Monin declared that, “Tacit knowledge is the starting point of all knowledge,” (2006, p. 73).

Individuals possess tacit knowledge through direct hands-on experience (Nonaka, 1994). Krylova et al. (2016) adds that tacit knowledge can be built through studying, doing, and via guided experiments, guided problem-solving, as well as observation with the support and involvement of supervisors and co-workers. Tacit knowledge is the consequence of personal reviews of failure, modification of ideas, misconceptions, and corrections (Puusa & Eerikäinen, 2010).

Tacit knowledge possess two attributes: a technical dimension which consists of casual (Mohajan, 2016) abilities, crafts, and expertise, and a cognitive dimension, which includes mental models or working models of the people, such as beliefs, schemata, perceptions of truth, the future, and the world (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012; Mohajan, 2016); also the views and values acquired by humans through their experiences (Mohajan, 2016). Nonaka (1994) indicates that the cognitive side additionally refers to individuals’ notion of truth, how they imagine their future, where their operating frameworks will create techniques which assists people make sense and define the world across them.

Individuals obtain tacit knowledge from the experiences they go through unconsciously, and whilst they are adapted to their environment. They create an illustration that demonstrates the relationships between the surroundings variables through a subconscious and inductive intellectual process (Agbim et al., 2013).

The sharing of tacit knowledge includes various ways, for example narration, storytelling (Venkitachalam & Busch, 2012), interviews (Whyte & Classen, 2012), recognition groups (Johannessen, et al., 1999), metaphors, drawings, and any technique of expression without a formal use of language (du Plessis, 2007). Whyte & Classen (2012) reported

that stories, in relation to the personal experiences of people, play a significant role in the sharing of tacit knowledge.

Nonaka (1994) offered the understanding creation concept and the Spiral Model of knowledge conversion. Knowledge creation within an enterprise as stated by (Nonaka & Von Krogh, 2009; Nonaka et al., 2006, p. 1179) is “the process of making available and amplifying knowledge created by individuals, as well as crystallizing and connecting it to an organization’s knowledge system”.

The Spiral Model of the method of knowledge conversion holds distinct styles in interaction amongst tacit and explicit knowledge expertise (Nonaka, 1994). It is constructed on active interplay amongst the four frameworks of conversion (Nonaka & Toyama, 2003). This Spiral Model (socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization) also referred to as SECI.

Tacit knowledge as reported by Erden et al. (2008) performs a major position in a successful innovation, however tacit knowledge does not origin from single being; as a substitute it is an accumulation of knowledge from corporations and groups.

Based on study of Simon (1947), Ocasio (1997) provided the attention-based view theory of the company indicating that the way organizations circulate and channel the focus of their decision makers ,creates the behaviour of a firm. The main focus of the attention-based view theory of the organization lays on how attention determine the adaptation of a firm or an enterprise, and it was embraced as a meta-theoretical angle in many theoretical and empirical work (Ocasio, 2011). The primary elements of attention-based view theory are attention, issues and answers, in addition to procedural and communication channels.

Issues refers to the catalogue of occasions through which decision makers recognize the surroundings around them, together with problems, opportunities, and threats facing the business firms. Answers refers to the catalogue of vements and action options for the troubles at handmo, which includes proposals, tasks, applications, workouts, and strategies.

The attention based theory presented by Ocasio (1997) also includes procedural and communication channels, which explains the situational context which incorporates all activities, communication, and interactions hooked up with the aid of the employer to steer people to take actions towards a specific listing of issues. There is a significant role played by the procedural and communication channels in focusing the attention of people, and inside the broader attention allocation inside the firms. It fulfills the purpose of processing of issues and answers for organizations, also the choices regarding strategic organizational actions (Ocasio, 1997).

Attention structures are the manners which govern the attention of time, effort, and attention concentration of the decision makers, including social economics, and cultural systems. Attention systems are influenced by:

(1) rules of the game, wherein the formal and casual standards and constrains guide choice-making (Ocasio, 1997).

(2) Attention structures are also laid low with resources of the corporation together with any tangible and intangible property.

(3) Structured position wherein the function of social identification governs the function of decision makers and their interrelationship with different structure positions in the employer.

Ultimately, and critical to this study; (4) Players or individuals that have an effect on a company's attention via their ideals, competencies, and values. Taken together, these four factors regulate attention to the internal and outside surroundings (Ocasio, 1997).

Managerial attention refers to the practices and routines managers follow to search, identify, select, and exploit opportunities and minimize risk. As managers deal on daily bases with piles of information, they need to be selective on which information to deal with. Attention is the final stage of information processing, and it directs how they distinguish between the different stimuli, and select which to consider, and which to ignore (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

According to Kumar and Demir (2013), managerial attention may be defined into 3 varieties of attention: (1) relative attention, in which attention closer to the issue and the object at the same time. It is considered as an aggressive process wherein the acknowledgement and credit are given to one subsidiary is relative to attention given to another subsidiary.

(2) memetic attention, wherein interest is toward an enterprise's tendency to replicate different other enterprises. Such mimicry is considered one of the vital trends of innovation dispersion (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

(3) implicit attention is associated with information waft and the tacit and explicit dimensions of knowledge (i.e., the externalization process, changing tacit to explicit knowledge) (Nonaka, 1994). In general, tacit knowledge is positioned in the conscious mind of people as it is observed inside the information of practices and actions that people execute. It exists at the back of any function performed by the individual; it simply needs implicit attention to be revealed. People, on the whole, exchange and adopt their practices unconsciously according to the state of affairs they may be encountering, based on their tacit experiences (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

Implicit attention is not intentional; also it creates consciousness in people. The body and mind play a role in shaping the sensitivity of implicit attention. This sensibility cause influence on the way people develop deep knowledge to the interpretation and measurement of a particular origin of knowledge in which they are intentionally involved (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

Drucker (1998) defined innovation as: "The specific function of entrepreneurship, whether in an existing business, a public service institution, or a new venture started by a lone individual in the family kitchen. It is the means by which the entrepreneur either creates new wealth-producing resources or endows existing resources with enhanced potential for creating wealth," (p. 3).

The innovation process follows these phases: (1) new idea generation (Van de Ven, 1999; Boer & Daring, 2001), (2)

idea crystallization and elaborating phase (Van de Ven, 1999; Boer & Daring, 2001), (3) designing phase (Eveleens, 2010), and (4) the idea implementation phase (Van de Ven, 1999; Boer & Daring, 2001).

Innovation depends on knowledge as a sources (Drucker, 1998), and on tacit knowledge in particular. Individuals who are involved in the innovation process along with their drivers and preferences impact the directions of innovation within the organization (Yadav et al., 2007).

Generally, tacit knowledge is considered and examined entirely, not including difference among technical and cognitive tacit knowledge (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012; Mohajan, 2016). Studies on tacit knowledge and innovation covers the influence of tacit knowledge through knowledge sharing on innovation of businesses, also the way it impacts the efficiency of an organization. Most of the studies attempt to address distinct models of innovation utilized by distinct schools of knowledge, however little is addressed regarding the manner in which tacit knowledge applied such models.

Attention and innovation are analyzed from the perspective of the way the concentration of individuals cause influence on exist and future innovation, in addition the manner in which it may affect management, planning activities and the selection of problems and solutions of a business. There is a little information regarding the link between attention and tacit knowledge. The study by (Kumar & Demir, 2013) included implicit attention relation to transition of tacit and explicit knowledge, however, unable to explore the way in which such relation may influence the innovation process. Hence, a very limited number of studies have been carried out on how tacit knowledge is transfer inside the innovation process or phases (Lawrence, 2014).

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

This research is designed to find the relationship among tacit knowledge and implicit attention, and the way such connection impacts the problems and solutions in the innovation process. The basis of this study is the knowledge creation theory and the attention-based view theory, and we will be applying the lens of implicit attention. The purpose is to explore the link of tacit knowledge with the aspects of attention inside the innovation process.

The design depends on the stories that interviewees share to reflect on the procedure they experienced while striving to reach a new notion for producing latest products, services, or procedures to the business.

Our research is mainly based on acquiring cognitive tacit knowledge which is concerned with the experiences of individuals (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012; Mohajan, 2016). In order to obtain this, the approach of qualitative inductive research was adopted (Gioia et al., 2013). We applied thematic analysis, as it offers an easy approach, able to be changed when needed, it also facilitates a complex account of data, and however it possesses details. This gives obtainable kind of analysis and is practicable in summing up crucial aspects of large sets of data. It affirms the study to adopt a structured approach for creating formed and accurate outcome reports (Nowell et al., 2010).

Present research undertakes the kind of semi-structured interviews comprising open-ended questions.

We utilized interviews as a major instrument of data collection with the aim to view our research study from the perspective of interviewees and to interpret the cause they arrived at such interpretation or outcome.

Semi-structured interviews were created to obtain subjective replies from people related to specific matter or a unique condition that have been exposed to them. The focus of interview questions is pertaining to the conditions, circumstances, cases, and stories that the interviewees ever exposed in the past and influenced the small innovation process from their view having a low level of power by the interviewer (King, 2004).

The purpose of the interviews is to declare transfer of tacit knowledge or its application by people as they were engaged in distinct levels of innovation process. The focus was on the manner tacit knowledge is retrieved when the interviewee thinking of a certain notion or concept. In addition, the focus was also laid on the interviewees' personal experiences found or around them, this cause impact on their selection of issues and answers in the procedure of innovation. Furthermore, the questions were addressed concerning why a specific decision was selected, and the components that were chosen for a particular notion and concerned answer.

Data collected from the interviews was analyzed, coded, and categorized (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2012) with the help of inductive technique to describe themes, patterns of action, and replies (Creed et al., 2010) applying thematic analysis.

## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1. Idea Generating Phase, Tacit Knowledge, and Attention

With the help of this research, we explored cognitive tacit knowledge, which takes part in the innovation process in the forms of (1) personal experiences, and (2) professional experiences. Such experiences appear to cause influence on people and establish particular knowledge which is inherited in their minds as tacit knowledge. Through the innovation process, this tacit knowledge will be retrieved and cause influence on the concepts introduced and its design.

The attention of the enterprise individuals cause impact on the innovation process (Kumar & Demir, 2013). Their attention and its link to their tacit knowledge are viewed as the critical determining factor on the innovative solutions introduced by the business. When the purpose of companies is to answer to certain challenges, it deals with various challenges, problems, or needs, which can be explored (Ocasio, 1997). The selection of concentration on particular problems and neglecting others depends on how a person sees and encompass the surroundings. This recognition is linked to their cognitive tacit knowledge to a certain degree (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012).

### 4.2. The Idea Generating Phase and Tacit Knowledge

This is the phase of producing a new product or service. In other words, the phase of the innovation technique in which

a particular concept is created (Van de Ven, 1999; Boer & During, 2001).

The cognitive attribute of tacit knowledge comprises perspectives, reviews, emotions, hunches, and ideals. These are normally acquired through accumulated experiences which belong to the person. In return, a person is influenced by the involvement and dedication of such experiences (Nonaka, 1994). Such experiences are considered to become the reason for growing a particular perspective, opinion, feeling, droop, or perception, which is inherent as tacit know-how via the internalization method of knowledge convergence.

(i). Personal Experiences and Implicit Attention Personal experiences are previous incidents or occasions that occurred to individuals in person, or to their own family or friends, and had an emotional impact on them. Personal experiences may range from simple adolescence memories, exceptional stories, and exposure to extra dramatic incidents. In addition, these experiences reside inside the character reminiscence, leading to certain views, reviews, and ideals. Such experiences may additionally provoke other memories or knowledge and build cumulative tacit knowledge.

People who experience past personal experiences, with an influence on them, apparently possess a relationship with implicit attention. Cognitive tacit knowledge created via these experiences is inherent within the conscious the mind. When individuals are exposed to comparable conditions, this tacit knowledge normally rises to the top by implicit attention, engulfing individuals in reminiscences and focusing their interest on it. This tacit knowledge is usually the muse of an answer or idea on how to solve the issue that is brought about via implicit interest.

(ii). Professional Experience and Implicit Attention Professional experiences attained over time create cognitive tacit knowledge. This tacit knowledge is brought about by means of implicit attention whilst someone is exposed to new situations.

To reiterate, professional experiences are the cumulative proficiencies that individuals benefit from running in a professional area. Some of those experiences from being expert might also have taken place inside the individual mind and created positive views, evaluations, and ideals which can be triggered in the future. When people deal with instances, they may reflect onto this related tacit knowledge through implicit attention; this retrieved tacit understanding impacts the selection of problems to solve and influences how humans try and determine answers.

### 4.3. The Idea Designing Phase, Factors of Tacit Knowledge and Attention

In the design phase of the innovation system, a concept, product, or provider is precise and crafted (Van de Ven, 1999; Boer & During, 2001). Generally, tacit knowledge is concerned within the process and is normally combined with other sources of explicit knowledge, along with desktop research, readings, or schooling. Sometimes, products and services are solely designed in line with tacit knowledge of the individual, which include perspectives, opinions, hunches, and ideals.

Moreover, collection of different experiences are also included in the course of design. Inside this segment, these experiences integrate with implicit attention to retrieve tacit knowledge which participates in choosing problems and solutions; and in return impacts the design of an idea.

#### (i) Personal Experiences and Implicit Attention

Personal experiences, whether those befell to the person directly or to their circle of relative's members and friends, is an element which participates in the generation of tacit knowledge. Resulted tacit knowledge performs a role in designing progressive ideas.

Personal experiences that affect people personally appear to live as tacit knowledge. In the designing phase of the innovation, people seek advice from tacit knowledge to layout the answer. Personal tacit knowledge can create accurate perspectives and ideals which make the individual use it to create a generalized perspective, with the perception that what they need is likewise what different individuals can also need on this unique situation.

Personal experiences which happened to individuals, appear to relate to implicit attention, Implicit attention influences the selection of issues and answers within the concept designing section. Suggested answers are based on related cognitive tacit know-how and are commonly brought about by way of implicit attention.

#### (ii) Professional Experience and Implicit Attention

Professional experiences, whether occurred in the past, or on the time of the idea designing phase, seem to create certain perspectives regarding the way things are imagined to be executed. At the designing phase, these views are used as the base of designing the provided solution.

Tacit knowledge, created with the aid of professional experiences which took place in the past, reside in conscious of the individual and are retrieved whilst the ones people are looking for solutions.

Professional experiences which might be dealt by the person at the time of designing the concept will seize their attention and be decided on as an issue to bring at hand, however the answer for those problems will make use of some other set of tacit knowledge, which may not be related to these particular experiences.

### **4.4. Idea Implementation Phase, Factors of Tacit Knowledge and Attention**

Data analysis did not show an immediate impact of tacit knowledge in the implementation phase. Despite that, all through the implementation phase, the conceptualization of an idea and design is examined. According to the consequences of the implementation technique, new or up-to-date model of the concept and tacit knowledge related to it is generated or shaped differently.

### **4.5. Cognitive Tacit Knowledge**

Nonaka & Von Krogh (2009) states that it is not easy to share tacit knowledge, however one can possibly share it. Through interviews and the interviewee's stories, we managed to apprehend tacit knowledge in the innovation process. These

testimonies were utilized as a medium to communicate tacit knowledge, as they commonly present feelings, emotions, pastimes, empathy, and perspectives (Gabriel & Griffiths, 2004). Stories initiate memories and endorse articulation of tacit knowledge through the externalization manner (Sakellariou et al., 2017). Through the testimonies we obtained from the interviewees regarding the journey they took to reach innovative or new ideas and describing the innovation manner they went through, cognitive tacit knowledge within the types of views, reviews, beliefs, emotions and hunches (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012; Mohajan, 2016) have been evident. These varieties of cognitive tacit knowledge replicate mental models (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012) and views of the person.

The effect of cognitive tacit knowledge is imposed on the innovation method with the aid of developing the inspiration of what is necessary and well worth investing time into finding a solution for it. Perspectives, reviews, ideals, and hunches may not be created on strong evidence, yet they shape the globe across the people and the way they see their surroundings. People may additionally have certain perspectives on certain issues, gadgets, occasions, and others. These perspectives might also have an effect on the activities performed by a person. Individuals justify their views based on their remark of the world around them, and over time, these perspectives may additionally come to be actual (Nonaka & Von Krogh, 2009). In the undertaking of organising a mission, service, or concept, this tacit knowledge exerts high effect on not only deciding on the purpose to commit themselves to, but, it also shapes the information of the products or services supplied.

The serial arrangement of stories confirmed that this tacit knowledge accumulated over the years and become stimulated via many elements through the years. These elements comprises various stories people went through (Nonaka, 1994; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Whyte & Classen, 2012; Mohajan, 2016) and became additionally shaped through how they translated those experiences. This sense of their experiences may vary from one person to the other, which makes it very personal. Two people can also have the same attitude about a certain topic, but they reach their perspectives through a unique set of experiences.

### **4.6. Knowledge Conversion**

The interaction of incidents or experiences demonstrates the transition of knowledge. Stories communicated in the research confirmed that information which the individual acquired from unique incidents is turned into tacit knowledge through the internalization process.

At the time of the innovation process, this tacit knowledge will be changed into explicit knowledge through externalization. Acquired tacit knowledge is externalized and shared within the innovation process. It can either be shared immediately in the form of perspectives, opinions, or ideas, Or it can be enclosed inside the concept or notion designing these intuitions, hunches, and emotions and may simply be determined with the help of the story at the back of it.

It is worth mentioning that the formation of the very last concept or design of the product or service is generally related to explicit knowledge associated with the tacit knowledge within reach. The effect of experiences on the selection of explicit knowledge to be applied is apparent through the stories shared by aid of the interviewees (Li, et al., 2013).

The evaluation of data demonstrated that the selection of externalized tacit knowledge by people, or what knowledge to be shared in the innovation process, is related to how experience interacts with attention, and with implicit attention. Implicit Attention and Cognitive Tacit Knowledge Implicit attention is concerned with the waft of knowledge between tacit to explicit. Implicit attention will bring up tacit knowledge created by personal or professional stories; it will form the awareness of individuals and how they understand the situation around them (Kumar & Demir, 2013).

The data analysis reported that implicit attention initiates tacit knowledge, which was previously established in a particular manner, affected people personally, leaving certain views and recollections. These previous experiences and relevant tacit knowledge generated an inactive anchor factor, prepared to be brought up. Past stories might be internalized and recalled forth with the assistance of implicit attention when confronted through present studies. Within the innovation process, people will return to this tacit knowledge and apply it in the creation of ideas at the stage of concept designing. Implicit attention and associated tacit knowledge have an effect on both, the selection of issues to tackle and the selection of suitable answers.

### 5.3. Theoretical Contributions

Our contribution through this research is to find out the cognitive tacit knowledge inside the innovation technique and how this sort of tacit knowledge influences concept producing, concept designing and concept implementation stages. Research confirmed that tacit knowledge is individually linked to the person instead of a group in the enterprise; in this manner, it is far personal and subjective (Puusa & Eerikäinen, 2010), this is supported by the findings of the present study. People have the tendency to generalize this cognitive tacit knowledge to others as real and exhibit the basis of what is essential and what is not, also what is really worth working on from a personal perspective. It is associated with the feelings and compassion of the character at the time of the innovation process.

The contribution of this study discovers the relationship between attention and cognitive tacit knowledge within the innovation process. Cognitive tacit knowledge interrelates with implicit attention. Implicit attention conjures up tacit knowledge which was obtained previously. The retrieved cognitive tacit knowledge in the form of perspectives, ideals, opinions and hunches, impacts the innovation manner in regard to what issues must be solved and how they have to be solved.

The incorporation between cognitive tacit knowledge and attention in the innovation process is highly associated with the personal mental forms, and the emotional part of people. We attempted, through this research, to make contributions to Knowledge Management, Attention, and Innovation dis-

cussions with the aid of linking the three subjects and imparting new findings. Our principal contribution is the personal and professional experiences which take part in obtaining tacit knowledge, especially in terms of innovation, and the way these experiences combine with attention in the innovation method to create new thoughts.

### REFERENCES

- Agbim, K. C., Owutuamor, Z. B., & Oriarewo, G. O. (2013). Entrepreneurship development and tacit knowledge: Exploring the link between entrepreneurial learning and individual know-how. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 5(2), 112.
- Alzalabani, A., Modi, R. S., & Haque, M. N. (2013). Theoretical perspective of social entrepreneurship: A study of determinants of social entrepreneurship in the context of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Modern Accounting and Auditing*, 9(4), 571.
- Ambrosini, V., & Bowman, C. (2001). Tacit knowledge: Some suggestions for operationalization. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(6), 811-829.
- Bhardwaj, M., & Monin, J. (2006). Tacit to explicit: An interplay shaping organization knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
- Boer, H., & During, W. E. (2001). Innovation, what innovation? A comparison between product, process and organizational innovation. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 22(1-3), 83-107.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology: Vol. 2. Research Designs* P 57.
- Bull, M., & Bull, M. (2008). Challenging tensions: Critical, theoretical and empirical perspectives on social enterprise. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 14(5), 268-275.
- Calantone, R. J., Cavusgil, S. T., & Zhao, Y. (2002). Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(6), 515-524.
- Chalmers, D. M., & Balan-Vnuk, E. (2013). Innovating not-for-profit social ventures: Exploring the microfoundations of internal and external absorptive capacity routines. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(7), 785-810.
- Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2004). Identity ambiguity and change in the wake of a corporate spin-off. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 49(2), 173-208.
- Creed, W. D., DeJordy, R., & Lok, J. (2010). Being the change: Resolving institutional contradiction through identity work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1336-1364.
- Drucker, P. F. (1998). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 149-157.
- du Plessis, M. (2007). The role of knowledge management in innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(4), 20-29.
- Erden, Z., Von Krogh, G., & Nonaka, I. (2008). The quality of group tacit knowledge. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 17(1), 4-18.
- Eveleens, C. (2010). Innovation management; A literature review of innovation process models and their implications. *Science*, 800, 900-916.
- Gabriel, Y., & Griffiths, D. S. (2004). Stories in organizational research. In C. Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research*: 114-126. London: Sage.
- Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods*, 16(1), 15-31.
- Johannessen, J.-A., Olsen, B., & Olaisen, J. (1999). Aspects of innovation theory based on knowledge-management. *International Journal of Information Management*, 19(2), 121-139.
- Koskinen, K. U., & Vanharanta, H. (2002). The role of tacit knowledge in innovation processes of small technology companies. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 80(1), 57-64.
- Krylova, K. O., Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2016). Knowledge transfer in knowledge-intensive organizations: The crucial role of improvisation in transferring and protecting knowledge. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 20(5), 1045-1064.
- Kumar, N., & Demir, R. (2013). Managerial attention and antecedents of knowledge source exploitation in MNCs. *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, 9(3), 271-300.

- Lam, A. (2000). Tacit Knowledge, organizational learning and societal institutions: An integrated framework. *Organization Studies*, 21(3), 487-513.
- Lawrence, T. B., Dover, G., & Gallagher, B. (2014). Managing social innovation. *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation Management*, 316-334.
- López-Nicolás, C. and Merono-Cerdán, A. (2011). Strategic knowledge management, innovation and performance. *International Journal of Information Management*.
- Mirvis, P., Herrera, M. E. B., Googins, B., & Albareda, L. (2016). Corporate social innovation: How firms learn to innovate for the greater good. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5014-5021.
- Mohajan, H. K. (2016). Sharing of tacit knowledge in organizations: A review. *American Journal of Computer Science and Engineering*, 3(2), 6-19.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37.
- Nonaka, I., & Konno, N. (1998). The concept of "Ba": Building a foundation for knowledge creation. *California Management Review*, 40(3), 40-54.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*: Oxford University Press.
- Nonaka, I., & Toyama, R. (2003). The knowledge-creating theory revisited: Knowledge creation as a synthesizing process. *Knowledge management Research and Practice*, 1(1), 2-10.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and leadership: A unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning*, 33(1), 5-34.
- Nonaka, I., & Von Krogh, G. (2009). Perspective - tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion: Controversy and advancement in organizational knowledge creation theory. *Organization Science*, 20(3), 635-652.
- Nonaka, I., Von Krogh, G., & Voelpel, S. (2006). Organizational knowledge creation theory: Evolutionary paths and future Advances. *Organization Studies*, 27(8), 1179-1208.
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1).
- Ocasio, W. (1993). The structuring of organizational attention and the enactment of economic adversity: A reconciliation of theories of failure-induced change and threat-rigidity.
- Ocasio, W. (1997). Towards an attention-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 187-206.
- Ocasio, W. (2011). Attention to attention. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1286-1296.
- Okuyama, R. (2017). Importance of tacit knowledge in incremental innovation: Implications from drug discovery cases. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 10(1), 118-130. doi: 10.1108/JSMA-02-2016-0016
- Peet, M. (2012). Leadership transitions, tacit knowledge sharing and organizational generativity. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(1), 45-60.
- Pol, E., & Ville, S. (2009). Social innovation: Buzz word or enduring term? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6), 878-885.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. University of Chicago Press.
- Puusa, A., & Eerikäinen, M. (2010). Is tacit knowledge really tacit? *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(3).
- Riege, A. (2005). Three-dozen knowledge-sharing barriers managers must consider. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(3), 18-35. doi:10.1108/13673270510602746
- Sakellariou, E., Karantinou, K., & Goffin, K. (2017). "Telling tales": Stories, metaphors and tacit knowledge at the fuzzy front-end of NPD. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 26(4), 353-369
- Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Saudi Ministry of Commerce and Industry (2016), Retrieved Dec 13, 2018 from <https://mci.gov.sa/en/MediaCenter/News/Pages/13-12-16-03.aspx>
- Saudi vision 2030 (2016) Retrieved Jan 7, 2018 from <https://www.vision2030.gov.sa/en/node>
- Seidler-de Alwis, R., & Hartmann, E. (2008). The use of tacit knowledge within innovative companies: Knowledge management in innovative enterprises. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 12(1), 133-147.
- Senker, J. (1995). Tacit knowledge and models of innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 4(2), 425-447.
- Smith, E. A. (2001). The role of tacit and explicit knowledge in the workplace. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(4), 311-321.
- Cavusgil, S. T., Calantone, R. J., & Zhao, Y. (2003). Tacit knowledge transfer and firm innovation capability. *Journal of business & industrial marketing*.
- Tuli, F. (2010). The basis of distinction between qualitative and quantitative research in social science: Reflection on ontological, epistemological and methodological perspectives. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 6(1).
- Van de Ven, A. H., Polley, D. E., Garud, R., & Venkataraman, S. (1999). Building an infrastructure for the innovation journey. *The Innovation Journey*, 149-180.
- Venkitachalam, K., & Busch, P. (2012). Tacit knowledge: review and possible research directions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(2), 357-372.
- Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. (2000). *Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- World Population Review (2021), Retrieved March 2, 2021 from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/saudi-arabia-population>
- Whyte, G., & Classen, S. (2012). Using storytelling to elicit tacit knowledge from SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 16(6), 950-962.
- Yadav, M. S., Prabhu, J. C., & Chandy, R. K. (2007). Managing the future: CEO attention and innovation outcomes. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(4), 84-101.

Received: May 05, 2023

Revised: May 10, 2023

Accepted: July 03, 2023

Copyright © 2023– All Rights Reserved

This is an open-access article.