

HUMAN CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION PERFORMANCE IN KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Sri Rochani Mulyani, Wawan Ichwanudin

Affiliation(s): Universitas Sangga Buana YPKP; Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa

Corresponding email(s): sri.rochani.mulyani@gmail.com; ichwan0308@untirta.ac.id

Abstract

Background: Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. **Aim:** This conceptual inquiry explains how the relationship between the focal practices and innovation performance operates in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. **Method:** A conceptual narrative synthesis draws on selected scholarly and institutional publications. The empirical record is coded by mechanism, boundary condition, delivery risk, and practical implication. **Results:** The synthesis identifies six linked mechanisms: strategic skill formation, knowledge sharing, absorptive capacity, cross-functional collaboration, experimentation and learning climate, retention and deployment of expertise. The empirical record assessment indicates that outcomes depend less on nominal adoption than on delivery quality, governance, learning, and fit with local capacity. **Conclusion:** Decision makers should define the expected outcome, assign responsibility, establish a small set of auditable indicators, and revise the intervention when empirical record contradicts its assumptions. **Contribution:** The analysis provides a conditional framework without claiming primary data that were not collected.

Keywords: human capital; innovation performance; knowledge-based participating bodies; absorptive capacity; learning; knowledge sharing

Introduction

Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. This issue is particularly important for knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. The central managerial question is not whether the focal practice is fashionable or technically available, but whether it changes information, incentives, coordination, and action in ways that improve innovation performance.

The analysis asks three questions. First, which mechanisms plausibly connect the focal practice with innovation performance? Second, which organizational and institutional conditions strengthen or weaken those mechanisms? Third, which delivery and measurement choices allow operational authorities to distinguish genuine capability from surface-level adoption?

Literature Review

Research relevant to human capital development and innovation performance in knowledge-based organizations crosses strategy, organization, technology, finance, and public-policy perspectives. Vial (2019) describes digital transformation as a process that changes value creation and organizational arrangements, while Teece (2007) emphasizes the capacity to sense change, seize opportunities, and reconfigure resources. Read together, these perspectives shift attention from possession of an input to the capability to use it reliably.

An input may be a platform, infrastructure asset, financial instrument, reporting rule, training program, or relationship. A capability is the repeated ability to combine that input with judgment and coordinated action. In knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, the distinction is decisive because adoption is observable immediately, while innovation performance often emerges later and may be influenced by several conditions at once.

For knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, efficiency and resilience create a specific tension. Strategic skill formation may reduce routine friction, yet knowledge sharing determines whether that improvement survives disruption. An intervention that raises average speed while concentrating dependence on one system, person, supplier, or channel can weaken innovation performance. The literature must therefore be read against both normal operations and periods of stress.

Information credibility is especially relevant to absorptive capacity and cross-functional collaboration. Participants will not alter behavior merely because information is available; they assess its timeliness, intelligibility, source, and practical relevance. In the present setting, trust is produced through consistent execution and fair exception handling. This helps explain why nominal adoption can coexist with weak innovation performance.

The resulting model places strategic skill formation, absorptive capacity, and experimentation and learning climate on the governance side, while knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and retention and deployment of expertise describe execution and learning. Their interaction is expected to shape innovation performance; no single mechanism is assumed to have the same effect across every organization, region, or user group.

Research Method

This article uses a purposive conceptual narrative synthesis of the selected publications cited in the references. It develops relationships through analytical interpretation rather than an exhaustive database search or pooled statistical estimation. No systematic screening count, interview sample, administrative dataset, or newly observed causal effect is reported. The framework and proposed indicators are intended for subsequent testing in the specified setting.

The analysis separates the focal outcome, the mechanisms that may connect actions to that outcome, the conditions that could weaken those mechanisms, and the observations needed to test the resulting propositions. These categories organize the discussion; they are not a report of independently validated coding or a quantitative evidence synthesis. Illustrative decision rules and measurement proposals should therefore be read as conceptual contributions.

Analytical theme	Central question	Operational evidence
Strategic skill formation	How does strategic skill formation influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to strategic skill formation.
Knowledge sharing	How does knowledge sharing influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to knowledge sharing.
Absorptive capacity	How does absorptive capacity influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to absorptive capacity.
Cross-functional collaboration	How does cross-functional collaboration influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to cross-functional collaboration.
Experimentation and learning climate	How does experimentation and learning climate influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to experimentation and learning climate.
Retention and deployment of expertise	How does retention and deployment of expertise influence innovation performance?	Ownership, routine, exception records, user behavior, and outcome indicators related to retention and deployment of expertise.

The principal limitation is that the analysis does not inherently use original interviews, surveys, experiments, or administrative microdata. Its results are therefore propositions supported by synthesis in place of estimates of effect size. The named authors should verify the interpretation, references, affiliations, and practical relevance before submission.

Results and Discussion

Strategic skill formation

The mechanism behind strategic skill formation concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice can reasonably be expanded. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, strategic skill formation ought to be examined together with knowledge sharing, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

The analytical issue is whether strategic skill formation changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. Operational reliability is shaped by how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Training

expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, strategic skill formation ought to be examined together with absorptive capacity, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. A bounded pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible delivery path.

The value of strategic skill formation should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. Within knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, strategic skill formation ought to be examined together with cross-functional collaboration, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

Knowledge sharing

The analytical issue is whether knowledge sharing changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, knowledge sharing ought to be examined together with absorptive capacity, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Managers accordingly should compare activity records with empirical record of reliability, user response, and consequences for innovation performance.

The value of knowledge sharing should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, knowledge sharing ought to be examined together with cross-functional collaboration, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

The mechanism behind knowledge sharing concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, knowledge sharing ought to be examined together with experimentation and learning climate, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Managers accordingly should compare

activity records with empirical record of reliability, user response, and consequences for innovation performance.

Discussion by Analytical Theme

Absorptive capacity

The value of absorptive capacity should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice can reasonably be expanded. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, absorptive capacity ought to be examined together with cross-functional collaboration, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for absorptive capacity with a lagging measure of innovation performance.

The mechanism behind absorptive capacity concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. Operational reliability depends on how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Training expenditure alone does not create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, absorptive capacity must be examined together with experimentation and learning climate, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based organizations whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Vial (2019) and OECD (2023) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

The analytical issue is whether absorptive capacity changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. Within knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, absorptive capacity ought to be examined together with retention and deployment of expertise, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for absorptive capacity with a lagging measure of innovation performance.

Cross-functional collaboration

The mechanism behind cross-functional collaboration concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, cross-functional collaboration ought to be examined together with experimentation and learning climate, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

The analytical issue is whether cross-functional collaboration changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, cross-functional collaboration ought to be examined together with retention and deployment of expertise, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. A bounded pilot, named owner, documented exception log, and explicit review threshold provide a defensible delivery path.

The value of cross-functional collaboration should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, cross-functional collaboration ought to be examined together with strategic skill formation, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. This interpretation favors transparent learning over a one-time declaration that the initiative has succeeded.

Discussion by Analytical Theme

Experimentation and learning climate

The analytical issue is whether experimentation and learning climate changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. Local constraints shape both the feasible design and the pace at which the practice can reasonably be expanded. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, experimentation and learning climate ought to be examined together with retention and deployment of expertise, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Managers accordingly should compare activity records with empirical record of reliability, user response, and consequences for innovation performance.

The value of experimentation and learning climate should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. Operational reliability is shaped by how the practice is connected to adjacent workflows and existing accountabilities. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, experimentation and learning climate ought to be examined together with strategic skill formation, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. The appropriate response is to test assumptions locally, preserve reversibility, and expand only after the operating mechanism is demonstrated.

The mechanism behind experimentation and learning climate concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. Within knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on

specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, responsibility, usable records, and exception routines determine whether the mechanism functions. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, experimentation and learning climate ought to be examined together with knowledge sharing, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Managers accordingly should compare activity records with empirical record of reliability, user response, and consequences for innovation performance.

Retention and deployment of expertise

The value of retention and deployment of expertise should be assessed at the point where routine work affects innovation performance. Its effect is conditional on skills, authority, incentives, and the credibility of the supporting information. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, retention and deployment of expertise ought to be examined together with strategic skill formation, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for retention and deployment of expertise with a lagging measure of innovation performance.

The mechanism behind retention and deployment of expertise concerns coordination: resources must reach the person able to use them before the decision window closes. Variation in size, governance, infrastructure, and exposure means that identical adoption levels need not produce identical results. Training expenditure alone does not create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, retention and deployment of expertise must be examined together with knowledge sharing, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based organizations whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Kraus et al. (2022) and Teece (2007) indicate that capability must be observed through repeated performance, not inferred from expenditure or installation.

The analytical issue is whether retention and deployment of expertise changes an actual decision, not simply whether a new procedure is visible. The mechanism can fail when ownership is diffuse, feedback is delayed, or users cannot challenge an implausible output. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. For this topic, retention and deployment of expertise ought to be examined together with absorptive capacity, because both shape innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning. Evaluation should combine a leading indicator for retention and deployment of expertise with a lagging measure of innovation performance.

Integrated Mechanism Framework

The six mechanisms form a connected operating system for knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning, not a checklist. Weakness in strategic skill formation can restrict knowledge sharing, while poor experimentation and learning climate may prevent lessons from reaching retention and deployment of expertise. For innovation performance, the value of one mechanism therefore is shaped by whether neighboring routines supply credible information, authority, and feedback.

The first pathway connects information to judgment. Strategic skill formation and knowledge sharing improve visibility, but decision quality also requires interpretation and an agreed response. The second pathway connects organization to execution through absorptive capacity and cross-functional collaboration. The third pathway connects accountability to adaptation through experimentation and learning climate and retention and deployment of expertise.

The conceptual structure predicts that innovation performance will be strongest when all three pathways reach a minimum viable level. Excellence in a single component cannot fully compensate for basic weakness elsewhere. This complementarity explains why participating bodies may invest substantially yet observe limited results: resources are allocated to the visible technology or program while less visible routines, responsibilities, and feedback processes remain unchanged.

Sequence matters for human capital development and innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies. A credible delivery starts with the concrete problem: Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. It then documents the current process, assigns ownership for strategic skill formation, pilots changes affecting knowledge sharing, and records exceptions before wider adoption. The empirical record from the pilot should determine whether expansion is justified.

Governance in this framework protects the purpose of improving innovation performance. It specifies authority for absorptive capacity, acceptable risk around cross-functional collaboration, documentation for experimentation and learning climate, and escalation when retention and deployment of expertise reveals failure. Proportionate controls make adaptation safer without turning every local decision into a centralized approval.

Managerial and Policy Implications

Decision makers should translate the objective of improving innovation performance into a small measurement architecture. Leading indicators capture whether the mechanism is operating; lagging indicators capture whether the intended outcome follows. Both are needed because an early increase in activity may reflect delivery effort in place of sustainable value.

Priority	Owner	Leading indicator	Review question
Strategic skill formation	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for strategic skill formation	Is strategic skill formation changing decisions or only activity?
Knowledge sharing	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for knowledge sharing	Is knowledge sharing changing decisions or only activity?

Priority	Owner	Leading indicator	Review question
Absorptive capacity	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for absorptive capacity	Is absorptive capacity changing decisions or only activity?
Cross-functional collaboration	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for cross-functional collaboration	Is cross-functional collaboration changing decisions or only activity?
Experimentation and learning climate	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for experimentation and learning climate	Is experimentation and learning climate changing decisions or only activity?
Retention and deployment of expertise	Named process owner	Completion and exception evidence for retention and deployment of expertise	Is retention and deployment of expertise changing decisions or only activity?

For managers, the immediate task is to establish a baseline, choose one bounded delivery unit, and review empirical record at a frequency matched to the decision cycle. For policy makers and industry bodies, the priority is to reduce avoidable coordination costs, improve access to reliable guidance, and support capability development in place of measuring success only by enrollment, installation, or nominal adoption.

Future research on human capital development and innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies should define populations and measures explicitly. Longitudinal observation is needed to determine whether retention and deployment of expertise produces durable learning or only a temporary response. Mixed methods could connect changes in innovation performance to the routines through which strategic skill formation and cross-functional collaboration are enacted.

Limitations and Future Research

Three limitations qualify the synthesis. The empirical record concerning knowledge-based participating bodies whose services and products depend on specialist expertise, collaboration, and continuous learning is heterogeneous and cannot establish one effect size for innovation performance. Institutional sources clarify context but cannot replace unit-level causal empirical record. In addition, the selected mechanisms may omit practices visible only through fieldwork, particularly where absorptive capacity or experimentation and learning climate is informal. The propositions accordingly should guide inquiry in place of be treated as universal estimates.

Future research should operationalize innovation performance with measures that distinguish activity, capability, and outcome. Comparative studies can examine whether organization size, ownership, regulatory exposure, location, or digital maturity changes the strength of the proposed relationships. Longitudinal observation is needed to separate temporary delivery disruption from durable improvement.

Conclusion

This conceptual inquiry examined human capital development and innovation performance in knowledge-based participating bodies through a conceptual narrative synthesis. The synthesis shows that innovation performance does not inherently arise automatically from formal adoption or expenditure. It is shaped by the interaction of strategic skill formation, knowledge sharing, absorptive capacity, cross-functional collaboration, experimentation and learning climate, retention and deployment of expertise.

The central conclusion is conditional. Training expenditure alone does not inherently create innovation when learning is detached from work, knowledge remains siloed, or employees lack time and incentives to experiment. Participating bodies accordingly should define the decision problem, build proportionate governance, test delivery in stages, and combine leading indicators with outcome empirical record. This approach treats uncertainty as something to manage through learning in place of conceal through overly precise claims.

The conceptual structure contributes a practical bridge between broad research findings and local decisions. It does not inherently replace author judgment, peer review, or empirical validation. Its value lies in making mechanisms and assumptions explicit so that managers, policy makers, and researchers can examine where an intervention is likely to work, where it may fail, and what empirical record should trigger revision.

References

- Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393553>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14>
- OECD. (2023). *OECD SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook 2023*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/342b8564-en>
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>