The American Journal of Engineering and Technology
ISSN 2689-0984 Volume 08 - 2026

Reconfiguring Knowledge, Learning, and Consulting Systems for Innovation-Driven Performance in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises

[1] Christopher D. Halbrook
[1] Department of Business Administration, University of Mannheim, Germany

Received: 24th Nov 2025 | Received Revised Version: 29th Dec 2025 | Accepted: 24th Jan 2026 | Published: 07th Fab 2026

Volume 08 Issue 02 2026 |

Abstract

Small and medium-sized enterprises increasingly operate in environments characterized by technological turbulence, knowledge fragmentation, and competitive intensity that challenge traditional managerial and strategic frameworks. Within this context, intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, and knowledge-based dynamic capabilities have emerged as foundational constructs for explaining how firms generate, sustain, and renew competitive advantage. At the same time, contemporary consulting for small and medium-sized enterprises has evolved beyond transactional advisory services toward complex, system-oriented models that integrate organizational learning, strategic alignment, and institutional embeddedness, as theorized in the comprehensive framework advanced by Kovalchuk (2025). Despite the rich bodies of literature on intellectual capital, learning organizations, absorptive capacity, and innovation systems, scholarly research has yet to systematically integrate these constructs with modern consulting architectures designed specifically for small and medium-sized enterprises. This gap is theoretically significant because SMEs differ fundamentally from large firms in resource endowments, managerial cognition, and structural flexibility, while also being disproportionately dependent on external knowledge and advisory networks for survival and growth.

The discussion situates these findings within broader debates on organizational learning, national innovation systems, and the evolving role of external knowledge intermediaries. It highlights how complex consulting models function as boundary-spanning institutions that enhance SMEs' participation in interactive learning networks described by Lundvall (1988) and Lundvall and Johnson (1994). The study concludes by outlining implications for theory, practice, and future research, emphasizing the necessity of viewing consulting not as an external add-on but as an embedded component of the SME knowledge ecosystem.

Keywords: Intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, small and medium-sized enterprises, organizational learning, innovation systems, business consulting

Cite This Article: Christopher D. Halbrook. (2026). Reconfiguring Knowledge, Learning, and Consulting Systems for Innovation-Driven Performance in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises. The American Journal of Engineering and Technology, 8(2), 26–33. Retrieved from https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajet/article/view/7390

1. Introduction

The Small and medium-sized enterprises occupy a paradoxical position within contemporary economies. On the one hand, they are celebrated as engines of innovation, employment, and regional development; on the other, they are structurally vulnerable due to limited financial resources, managerial capacity, and access to advanced knowledge infrastructures, a duality that has been repeatedly emphasized in innovation system research (Lundvall, 1992). The growing complexity of markets, accelerated technological change, and the increasing importance of intangible assets have intensified this paradox, making it increasingly difficult for SMEs to rely solely on traditional competitive

strategies rooted in cost leadership or niche specialization. Instead, survival and growth have become contingent upon the ability to generate, acquire, and recombine knowledge in ways that continuously renew products, processes, and business models, an argument consistent with the knowledge-based view of the firm elaborated by Kor and Mahoney (2004).

Within this evolving context, intellectual capital has emerged as one of the most influential theoretical constructs for explaining how firms convert intangible resources into economic and innovative performance. Intellectual capital is commonly understood as comprising human capital, structural capital, and relational capital, each of which contributes in distinct but interrelated ways to organizational value creation (Kar and Khavandkar, 2013). Human capital encompasses the skills, experience, and creative capacities of employees; structural capital refers to organizational routines, databases, and processes that embed knowledge within the firm; and relational capital captures the value of relationships with customers, suppliers, and external partners, a dimension particularly salient for SMEs that often rely on networks rather than scale (Khalique et al., 2015). Empirical studies have repeatedly demonstrated that intellectual capital is positively associated with innovation and performance across sectors and institutional contexts (Joshi et al., 2010; Kamukama et al., 2011).

Yet intellectual capital alone does not guarantee innovative success. What matters is not merely the possession of knowledge assets but the firm's capacity to mobilize and transform them in response to environmental change. This insight has led to the development of the absorptive capacity construct, which conceptualizes the firm's ability to recognize the value of new external information, assimilate it, and apply it to commercial ends (Jansen et al., 2005). Absorptive capacity is inherently dynamic, reflecting not only prior knowledge but also organizational processes, managerial cognition, and learning routines that determine how effectively new ideas are integrated into ongoing operations (Mangematin and Nesta, 1999). For SMEs, whose internal knowledge bases are often narrow, absorptive capacity is especially critical because it mediates the relationship between external knowledge sources and internal innovation outcomes, as shown by Knudsen and Roman (2004).

A parallel stream of research has focused on organizational learning and the learning organization as foundational enablers of innovation. Studies have shown that firms characterized by open communication, participatory decision-making, and continuous learning routines are more capable of adapting to change and leveraging knowledge for innovation (Hoon Song et al., 2011). Corporate culture and information systems also play crucial roles in shaping absorptive capacity by influencing how knowledge is shared, codified, and used, as demonstrated by Harrington and Guimaraes (2005). In SMEs, where formal structures are often less developed, the cultural and relational dimensions of learning may be even more important than in large organizations.

Despite the richness of this literature, a significant gap remains in understanding how these internal knowledge-based capabilities interact with external advisory and consulting systems that increasingly shape SME development trajectories. Traditional consulting models, which focused on delivering discrete technical or strategic advice, are increasingly inadequate in environments characterized by systemic interdependence and rapid change. Recognizing this limitation, Kovalchuk (2025) proposed a complex model of business consulting for small and medium-sized enterprises that integrates theory, methodology, and practice into a coherent architecture designed to enhance organizational learning, strategic alignment, and sustainable competitiveness. This model emphasizes that consulting should function as a dynamic, co-creative process embedded within the SME's knowledge ecosystem rather than as a one-off intervention, a perspective that resonates strongly with interactive learning theories in innovation studies (Lundvall, 1988).

The theoretical significance of Kovalchuk's (2025) contribution lies in its explicit recognition that SMEs require consulting frameworks that are sensitive to their resource constraints, cognitive structures, and network embeddedness. Rather than imposing standardized best practices, the complex consulting model advocates adaptive, feedback-driven engagement that aligns with the firm's absorptive capacity and intellectual capital profile. However, while the monograph provides a rich conceptual and practical foundation, it does not explicitly integrate its consulting architecture with the broader theoretical constructs of intellectual capital and absorptive capacity that dominate the innovation and strategic management literature. This omission limits the model's explanatory power and its potential to be evaluated and refined within a cumulative scientific framework.

The present study addresses this gap by developing an integrated theoretical framework that situates Kovalchuk's (2025) complex consulting model within the intellectual capital and absorptive capacity paradigms. By doing so, it seeks to answer a fundamental research question: how do intellectual capital and absorptive capacity interact with complex consulting architectures to shape innovation and performance in small and medium-sized enterprises? This question is not merely academic. In policy and practice, billions of euros are invested annually in SME consulting, training, and advisory programs across Europe and other regions, yet their outcomes are highly variable, suggesting that the effectiveness of consulting depends on deeper organizational and cognitive factors that are poorly understood (Lundvall, 1992).

The problem is further compounded by the heterogeneity of SMEs. Unlike large corporations, SMEs vary widely in terms of ownership structure, managerial professionalism, technological orientation, and market scope. As a result, a consulting intervention that is transformative for one firm may be irrelevant or even disruptive for another, an insight consistent with the contingency perspective articulated by Miles and Snow (1984). Understanding this heterogeneity requires a framework that links internal capabilities with external support mechanisms in a nuanced and dynamic way, something that existing research has not yet fully achieved.

This article therefore advances three interrelated objectives. First, it provides a theoretically grounded elaboration of intellectual capital and absorptive capacity in the specific context of SMEs, drawing on both classic and contemporary scholarship (Han and Li, 2015; Jansen et al., 2005). Second, it critically interprets Kovalchuk's (2025) complex consulting model through the lens of knowledge-based and learning-oriented theories of the firm, thereby situating the model within a broader academic discourse. Third, it synthesizes these strands into an integrative framework that explains how consulting, intellectual capital, and absorptive capacity jointly shape innovation performance and strategic adaptability in SMEs.

By pursuing these objectives, the study contributes to multiple literatures. For intellectual capital research, it extends the focus from internal measurement and management to the external institutional mechanisms that enable or constrain knowledge utilization. For absorptive capacity theory, it highlights the role of consulting as a catalyst and moderator of learning processes. For innovation and SME studies, it provides a more comprehensive account of how firms navigate complex knowledge environments through both internal capabilities and external relationships. Finally, for practitioners and policymakers, it offers a theoretically informed lens through which to design and evaluate consulting and support programs for SMEs.

The remainder of the article develops this argument in depth. The methodology outlines the interpretive and integrative approach adopted to synthesize diverse bodies of literature. The results present a richly elaborated analytical model of how intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, and complex consulting interact. The discussion situates these findings within broader theoretical debates and identifies implications for future research and practice. Throughout, the analysis remains grounded in the foundational insights of Kovalchuk (2025) while engaging critically with the wider corpus of innovation and knowledge management scholarship.

2. Methodology

The methodological orientation of this study is rooted in theory-driven qualitative synthesis rather than in statistical hypothesis testing, an approach that is particularly appropriate for research questions that seek to integrate complex, multidimensional constructs such as intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, and consulting architectures into a coherent explanatory framework (Hoogland and Boomsma, 1998). Given the heterogeneous nature of SMEs and the conceptual breadth of the constructs involved, a purely quantitative approach would risk reducing rich organizational phenomena to narrow indicators that obscure rather than illuminate the underlying dynamics, a limitation already highlighted in the mediation and reliability literature (Hoyle and Kenny, 1999).

The primary methodological strategy employed here is integrative theoretical analysis. This involves systematically examining, comparing, and synthesizing the conceptual frameworks, empirical findings, and theoretical arguments contained in the references provided, with particular attention to the monographic contribution of Kovalchuk (2025). The objective is not to aggregate data in a statistical sense but to construct a higher-order model that captures the relationships among constructs in a way that is logically coherent, empirically grounded, and theoretically generative, a strategy commonly used in innovation and organizational theory

research (Mendelson and Pillai, 1999).

The first step in this process was the analytical deconstruction of the key constructs. Intellectual capital was disaggregated into its human, structural, and relational dimensions following Kar and Khavandkar (2013) and Khalique et al. (2015). Absorptive capacity was conceptualized in terms of potential and realized components, as elaborated by Jansen et al. (2005), reflecting the distinction between the ability to acquire and assimilate knowledge and the ability to transform and exploit it. The complex consulting model proposed by Kovalchuk (2025) was analyzed in terms of its theoretical foundations, methodological principles, and practical mechanisms, focusing on how it structures interactions between consultants and SMEs to facilitate learning and strategic change.

The second step involved mapping relationships among these constructs based on existing empirical and theoretical insights. For example, Han and Li (2015) demonstrated that intellectual capital influences innovative performance through knowledge-based dynamic capabilities, a finding that implies a mediating role for absorptive capacity. Hsu and Sabherwal (2012) provided evidence of reciprocal relationships between intellectual capital and knowledge management processes, suggesting feedback loops rather than linear causality. These insights were used to inform the development of an interactional rather than a purely causal model, consistent with evolutionary and systems-based theories of innovation (Lundvall, 1988).

The third step was the contextualization of these relationships within the specific institutional and organizational realities of SMEs. Research on absorptive capacity in small firms has shown that organizational antecedents such as managerial cognition, communication patterns, and external networks play a disproportionately large role compared to formal structures (Jones and Craven, 2001; Knudsen and Roman, 2004). These findings were integrated with Kovalchuk's (2025) emphasis on adaptive, co-creative consulting to hypothesize how consulting interventions might amplify or dampen the effects of intellectual capital on innovation.

Throughout this process, attention was paid to counter-arguments and alternative interpretations in the literature. For instance, some scholars have argued that excessive reliance on external consultants can erode internal capabilities and create dependency, a concern implicitly raised in studies of HRM practices and innovation (Michie and Sheehan, 1999). Others have suggested that the benefits of intellectual capital are contingent on sectoral and institutional contexts (Laursen, 2000a). These perspectives were not dismissed but incorporated into a more nuanced model that recognizes both enabling and constraining effects of consulting and knowledge assets.

A critical methodological limitation of this approach is that it does not provide direct empirical measurement of the proposed relationships. However, given the exploratory and integrative objectives of the study, this limitation is offset by the depth of theoretical and empirical grounding provided by the extensive literature base. Moreover, as Hoogland and Boomsma (1998) noted, robustness in theoretical modeling can be achieved through triangulation of multiple empirical and conceptual sources, even in the absence of new data.

By adopting this methodology, the study aligns with a tradition of analytical synthesis in innovation and organizational research that seeks to build cumulative knowledge by connecting rather than fragmenting existing theories (Mowery and Rosenberg, 1989). The result is a framework that, while not statistically tested, is sufficiently detailed and theoretically coherent to guide future empirical research and practical experimentation in the field of SME consulting and innovation.

3. Results

The integrative analysis undertaken in this study yields a set of interrelated findings that collectively illuminate how intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, and complex consulting architectures interact to shape innovation performance and strategic adaptability in small and medium-sized enterprises. These results are interpretive rather than numerical, grounded in the convergent and divergent insights of the literature and in the conceptual architecture articulated by Kovalchuk (2025).

One of the most salient findings is that intellectual capital functions as both a resource base and a dynamic system whose value depends on organizational processes and external interfaces. Human capital, in particular, emerges as a critical driver of absorptive capacity because it provides the cognitive and experiential foundations necessary to recognize and interpret new knowledge (Han and Li, 2015). In SMEs, where employees often perform multiple roles, the depth and breadth of

individual expertise can compensate for limited formal structures, enabling more flexible and creative responses to consulting inputs, a pattern consistent with observations in the Pakistani SME context reported by Khalique et al. (2015). However, human capital alone is insufficient if not supported by structural capital that stabilizes and codifies learning, an insight reinforced by Hsu and Sabherwal (2012), who showed that knowledge management systems mediate the relationship between individual expertise and organizational outcomes.

Relational capital emerges as an equally important dimension, particularly in the context of consulting. SMEs with strong ties to customers, suppliers, and knowledge intermediaries are better positioned to leverage consulting engagements because these relationships provide channels for the acquisition and validation of external knowledge (Kamukama et al., 2011). The complex consulting model of Kovalchuk (2025) explicitly builds on this insight by treating consultants not as isolated experts but as nodes within a broader network of knowledge exchange, thereby enhancing the firm's relational capital while simultaneously drawing upon it. This reciprocal dynamic suggests that consulting can be both a beneficiary and a generator of relational capital, creating virtuous cycles of learning and collaboration.

A second major finding concerns the role of absorptive capacity as a mediator between intellectual capital and innovation. Consistent with the distinction between potential and realized absorptive capacity proposed by Jansen et al. (2005), the analysis indicates that SMEs may possess the ability to acquire and assimilate knowledge but still fail to translate it into innovation if transformation and exploitation mechanisms are weak. Consulting interventions, as conceptualized by Kovalchuk (2025), are particularly effective in bridging this gap by providing structured processes for reflection, experimentation, and implementation that convert abstract knowledge into actionable strategies. This finding aligns with Knudsen and Roman's (2004) observation that organizational routines and managerial support are crucial for the effective use of innovations in small organizations.

The results also reveal significant heterogeneity in how SMEs respond to consulting, a pattern that can be explained by differences in intellectual capital profiles and learning orientations. Firms with high levels of structural capital, such as well-developed routines and information systems, are better able to absorb and institutionalize the recommendations provided by consultants, leading to more sustained performance improvements (Harrington and Guimaraes, 2005). In contrast, firms that rely primarily on tacit knowledge and informal processes may experience short-term gains from consulting but struggle to sustain them, an outcome consistent with the contingency perspective on organizational fit articulated by Miles and Snow (1984).

Another important result concerns the systemic nature of innovation in SMEs. Drawing on the interactive learning framework of Lundvall (1988), the analysis suggests that consulting is most effective when it enhances the firm's participation in broader innovation networks rather than focusing narrowly on internal efficiency. Kovalchuk's (2025) model, with its emphasis on embedding consulting within the firm's strategic and relational context, supports this systemic orientation by encouraging SMEs to align internal learning processes with external opportunities. This alignment increases the likelihood that new knowledge will be not only acquired but also recombined with existing capabilities to generate novel products and services.

Finally, the results indicate that the effectiveness of consulting is contingent on cultural and organizational factors that shape learning and knowledge sharing. Hoon Song et al. (2011) demonstrated that a learning organization environment fosters more effective organizational learning processes, and this study's synthesis suggests that such environments also amplify the impact of consulting. SMEs characterized by open communication, trust, and a willingness to experiment are more likely to engage consultants as partners in a joint learning process, consistent with the co-creative ethos of Kovalchuk (2025), whereas more hierarchical or risk-averse firms may treat consulting as a compliance exercise with limited transformative potential.

Taken together, these results support a model in which intellectual capital provides the foundational resources, absorptive capacity mediates the conversion of those resources into innovation, and complex consulting architectures act as catalysts and coordinators that align internal and external knowledge flows. This triadic relationship is dynamic and context-dependent, reflecting the evolutionary nature of learning and innovation in small and medium-sized enterprises (Lundvall and Johnson, 1994).

4. Discussion

The findings of this study invite a deeper theoretical reflection on the nature of knowledge, learning, and external intervention in small and medium-sized enterprises. At a fundamental level, they challenge linear models of innovation that treat consulting as an exogenous input and intellectual capital as a static stock, instead supporting a systemic and evolutionary perspective in which firms, consultants, and knowledge networks co-evolve over time, an idea deeply rooted in the innovation systems tradition (Lundvall, 1992).

One of the most significant theoretical implications concerns the reconceptualization of intellectual capital. While much of the literature has focused on measuring intellectual capital as a set of assets, the integrative framework developed here suggests that its true strategic value lies in its interaction with absorptive capacity and external knowledge infrastructures. This view resonates with Han and Li's (2015) emphasis on knowledge-based dynamic capabilities but extends it by highlighting the role of consulting as an institutionalized mechanism for capability development. In this sense, consultants become not merely advisors but facilitators of dynamic capability formation, a role that is explicitly theorized in Kovalchuk's (2025) complex consulting model.

This reconceptualization also sheds light on long-standing debates about the relative importance of internal versus external knowledge. Resource-based theorists have traditionally emphasized the primacy of internal resources for competitive advantage (Kor and Mahoney, 2004), while innovation system scholars have stressed the importance of external interactions and networks (Lundvall, 1988). The present study suggests that this dichotomy is false: internal intellectual capital and external consulting are mutually constitutive rather than competing sources of advantage. Consultants draw on and shape the firm's human and relational capital, while the firm's absorptive capacity determines how effectively consulting inputs are utilized, creating a feedback loop that blurs the boundary between inside and outside.

Another important theoretical implication concerns the nature of absorptive capacity in SMEs. Much of the existing literature, including Jansen et al. (2005), has been developed in the context of larger firms with formalized R and D and knowledge management systems. The present analysis indicates that in SMEs, absorptive capacity is more heavily influenced by managerial cognition, organizational culture, and relational embeddedness, making it more malleable but also more fragile. Consulting, as conceptualized by Kovalchuk (2025), can strengthen these soft dimensions by fostering shared understanding, strategic reflection, and learning routines, thereby enhancing both potential and realized absorptive capacity.

The discussion also highlights important contingencies and limitations. Not all consulting is beneficial, and not all intellectual capital is equally valuable. Studies of HRM practices and innovation have shown that inappropriate or poorly aligned interventions can crowd out intrinsic motivation and disrupt existing complementarities (Laursen and Foss, 2000; Michie and Sheehan, 1999). The complex consulting model addresses this risk by emphasizing alignment and co-creation, but its effectiveness still depends on the consultant's ability to understand and adapt to the firm's specific context, an ability that varies widely in practice. Moreover, sectoral differences in knowledge bases and innovation trajectories, as noted by Laursen (2000a), may limit the generalizability of any single consulting framework.

From a policy perspective, the findings suggest that SME support programs should move beyond standardized advisory services toward more flexible, learning-oriented models that recognize heterogeneity in intellectual capital and absorptive capacity. This aligns with the learning economy perspective of Lundvall and Johnson (1994), which emphasizes the role of institutions in shaping interactive learning processes. By adopting consulting models that are sensitive to firm-specific knowledge profiles, policymakers can enhance the return on investment in SME support and foster more sustainable innovation ecosystems.

For future research, the integrative framework developed here opens multiple avenues. Empirical studies could operationalize the constructs and relationships proposed, using mixed methods to capture both quantitative performance outcomes and qualitative learning processes, an approach consistent with the robustness considerations discussed by Hoogland and Boomsma (1998). Longitudinal research could examine how consulting engagements influence the evolution of intellectual capital and absorptive capacity over time, providing deeper insight into causal dynamics. Comparative studies across sectors and countries could explore how institutional contexts shape the effectiveness of complex consulting models, building on the national innovation system literature (Lundvall, 1992).

In sum, the discussion underscores that understanding innovation in SMEs requires an integrative perspective that encompasses internal resources, learning processes, and external support mechanisms. By situating Kovalchuk's (2025) complex consulting model within the broader intellectual capital and absorptive capacity literature, this study contributes to a more holistic and dynamic theory of SME development in the knowledge economy.

5. Conclusion

This research has developed a comprehensive theoretical framework that integrates intellectual capital, absorptive capacity, and complex consulting architectures to explain innovation and performance in small and medium-sized enterprises. Drawing on a wide range of scholarly sources and anchored in the systemic consulting model articulated by Kovalchuk (2025), the study has shown that SMEs' ability to innovate depends not only on their internal knowledge assets but also on their capacity to learn from and collaborate with external advisors and networks.

By reconceptualizing consulting as an embedded, co-creative process that shapes and is shaped by intellectual capital and absorptive capacity, the study advances both theory and practice. It highlights the need for more nuanced, learning-oriented approaches to SME support and provides a foundation for future empirical research that can further refine and test the proposed relationships. In an era of rapid technological and economic change, such integrative perspectives are essential for understanding how small and medium-sized enterprises can achieve sustainable competitiveness through knowledge, learning, and collaboration.

References

1. Hoon Song, J., Jeung, C.-W., & Hyoung Cho, S. (2011). The impact of the learning organization environment on the organizational learning process in the Korean business context. The Learning Organization, 18(6), 468-485.
2. Mowery, D., & Rosenberg, N. (1989). Technology and the Pursuit of Economic Growth. Cambridge University Press.
3. Kar, J. K., & Khavandkar, E. (2013). Intellectual Capital: Management, Development and Measurement Models. MSRT Press.
4. Lundvall, B.-A., & Johnson, B. (1994). The learning economy. Journal of Industry Studies, 1(2), 23-42.
5. Han, Y., & Li, D. (2015). Effects of intellectual capital on innovative performance: The role of knowledge-based dynamic capability. Management Decision, 53(1), 40-56.
6. Jansen, J. J., Van Den Bosch, F. A., & Volberda, H. W. (2005). Managing potential and realized absorptive capacity: How do organizational antecedents matter? Academy of Management Journal, 48(6), 999-1015.
7. Kovalchuk, A. (2025). Complex model of business consulting for small and medium-sized enterprises: Theory, methodology and practice of implementation. Internauka Publishing House; Tuculart Edition. https://doi.org/10.25313/Kovalchuk-Monograph-2025-90
8. Michie, J., & Sheehan, M. (1999). HRM practices, R and D expenditure and innovative investment: Evidence for the UKs 1990 Workplace Industrial Relations Survey. Industrial and Corporate Change, 8, 211-234.
9. Knudsen, H. K., & Roman, P. M. (2004). Modeling the use of innovations in private treatment organizations: The role of absorptive capacity. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 26(1), 51-59.
10. Khalique, M., Bontis, N., Abdul Nassir bin Shaari, J., & Hassan Md. Isa, A. (2015). Intellectual capital in small and medium enterprises in Pakistan. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 16(1), 224-238.
11. Harrington, S. J., & Guimaraes, T. (2005). Corporate culture, absorptive capacity and IT success. Information and Organization, 15(1), 39-63.
12. Kor, Y. Y., & Mahoney, J. T. (2004). Edith Penrose contributions to the resource based view of strategic management. Journal of Management Studies, 41(1), 183-191.
13. Hoogland, J. J., & Boomsma, A. (1998). Robustness studies in covariance structure modeling. Sociological Methods and Research, 26(3), 329-367.
14. Kamukama, N., Ahiauzu, A., & Ntayi, J. M. (2011). Competitive advantage as mediator of intellectual capital and performance. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 12(1), 152-164.
15. Lundvall, B.-A. (1988). Innovation as an interactive process. In Technical Change and Economic Theory. Pinter Publishers.
16. Jones, O., & Craven, M. (2001). Expanding capabilities in a mature manufacturing firm. International Small Business Journal, 19(3), 39-55.
17. Hsu, I. C., & Sabherwal, R. (2012). Relationship

between intellectual capital and knowledge management. Decision Sciences, 43(3), 489-524.
18. Lundvall, B.-A. (1992). National Systems of Innovation. Pinter Publishers.
19. Mangematin, V., & Nesta, L. (1999). What kind of knowledge can a firm absorb? International Journal of Technology Management, 18(3-4), 149-172.
20. Laursen, K. (2000a). The importance of sectoral differences in the application of new HRM practices for innovation performance. LINK Working Paper.
21. Laursen, K., & Foss, N. J. (2000). New HRM practices, complementarities, and the impact on innovative performance. LINK Working Paper.
22. Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (1984). Fit, failure and the hall of fame. California Management Review, 26, 10-18.
23. Joshi, M., Cahill, D., & Sidhu, J. (2010). Intellectual capital performance in the banking sector. Journal of Human Resource Costing and Accounting, 14(2), 151-170.