

STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF ORGANIZATIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCY THROUGH INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL

Fitri H., Nugraha A.T., Hakimah Y., Manihuruk C.*

Abstract: Managing organizational knowledge and employee's competency is observed as key towards success. However, significance of intellectual capital for strategic management of knowledge and organizational competency has got limited attention in the literature. The aim of present study is to examine the impact of intellectual capital on strategic management of knowledge and competency from the context of Indonesia. A sample of 242 respondents is collected through developed questionnaire. From methodological context, study has followed descriptive and regression analysis. It is observed that significant association exists between various items of Intellectual capital and strategic management of knowledge and competency. Findings are significantly suggested to policy makers and strategic decision takers in the business and relevant industry. Key limitations includes limited sample and non-application of cross-sectional analysis.

Keywords: Intellectual capital, human capital, structural capital, spiritual capital, strategic management, Indonesia

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2019.19.2.11

Article's history:

Received January 16, 2019; Revised April 13, 2019; Accepted April 22, 2019

Introduction

To achieve the long-term objectives of the business, strategic management plays significant role. The idea of SM consist of formulating, implementing along with evaluating the decisions conducted by the management over time (Stukalina, 2014). For the business organizations, SM is the formal process, combining the various departments like management, finance, accounting, and information system as well (McKiernan et al., 2006). It is a common notion that strategic practices are based on strategic objectives, defined by top level management. While taking the long run challenges into account, business organizations have to work under short term through tactical planning (McKiernan, 2006; Lari et al., 2017). As per the findings of (Makanga and Paul, 2017) there are four basic steps in SM, covering the title of strategic development to the strategic implementation as well. To implement a planned strategy, business firms need strategic leadership which can

* Dr. **Hadiati Fitri**, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas YARSI, Jakarta, Indonesia; Dr. **Andhyka Tyaz Nugraha**, Post Doc., School of Technology Management and Logistics, College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Sintok, Malaysia; Dr. **Yusro Hakimah**, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Tridianti University, Palembang, Indonesia; Dr. **Christianus Manihuruk**, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Economics, STIE International Golden Institute, Jakarta, Indonesia.

✉ Corresponding author: hadiati.fitri@gmail.com

provide present and future directions. it is observed that SM practices will only be significant when they are applied as per desired situation. Organizational success is linked to the situation where it overcomes different risks to create better decisions in more effective way.

Literature Review

Literature context of integration between IC and SM of knowledge and competency is very limited. However, few studies have provided their significant contribution in this context. For instance, (Cabrilo and Dahms, 2018) have examined the moderating effect of SM of knowledge on the association between IC and innovation and performance of market. It is observed that specific combination of IC and its components can lead to higher level of innovation in the market and improved organizational performance as well. Key contribution of the study indicates the combining effect of IC and SM of knowledge and competency in the field of business and management sciences. Some other studies like (Jordão and Novas, 2017; Kianto et al., 2014) have explained the fact that KM and IC needs significant attention for their conceptual and empirical association. It is observed that to maintain the business firm, there is a causal association between IC and KM.

Research studies conducted by (Snyman and Kruger, 2004; Tyagi and Siddiqui, 2017) explain that business organization needs to ensure their knowledge programs and knowledge strategy, which are consistent with corporate aim, sources, culture, and employees' skill. When business firm align their strategy for KM with the business strategy, overall business moves in a direction which provide competitive advantage. During the past few years, this idea has gained significant strength. In their study (Santoro et al., 2018) have pointed out KM helps the business units to effectively use their internal knowledge to create value and innovative outcomes. From the context of management studies, idea of intellectual capital or IC is observed as key source for the business (Kianto et al., 2014; Markhaichuk and Zhuckovskaya, 2019; Wang et al., 2016). Intellectual capital in the business refers to the capabilities of core employees covering the title like skills of employees, their competencies, core expertise, valuable knowledge and other abilities, through which business can get competitive advantage. While knowledge management in the business can put IC into action for the superior business performance where KM needs to integrate with the improved business strategy (Wiig, 1997 and 1999; Zhou and Fink, 2003). This study has conducted an empirical investigation for the impact of IC and strategic management of knowledge and competency in Indonesian business firms. Some other studies have also examined the strategic management of knowledge. In this regard, (Choo and Bontis, 2002; Maziku, 2016) have examined the idea of strategic management of knowledge and intellectual capital of the business firms while addressing range of issues. They have claimed the fact that business organizations are dealing with explicit and implicit type of knowledge for which strategic management is very necessary. In addition, they

claim that intellectual capital is a key source through which business firms get the advantage over its rivals in the market place. However, further classification of intellectual capital provides another open discussion. Based on the above literature, following hypotheses have been defined.

H0: There is no significant relationship between human capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H1: There is a significant relationship between human capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H01: There is no significant relationship between structural capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H2: There is a significant relationship between structural capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H02: There is no significant relationship between relational capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H3: There is a significant relationship between relational capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H03: There is no significant relationship between spiritual capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

H4: There is a significant relationship between spiritual capital and strategic management of organizational knowledge and competency.

Description of Variables

Strategic management of Knowledge (SMK) and Competency

Strategic management of knowledge and competency to business is a fundamental task as it is among the key challenges (Winter and Teece, 1998). Knowledge management refers to the way business is dealing with the acquisition of the knowledge, dissemination of knowledge and finally responding towards the knowledge (Gold et al., 2001; Ichijo and Nonaka, 2006; EmenikeKalu and Obasi 2016; Salem et al., 2016). These three stages integrate overall idea of KM in the business organization. SM of knowledge indicates the capacity of the firm to develop long term action plans for the management of business knowledge through its employees (Claver-Cortés et al., 2018; Haseeb et al., 2018). This study has considered five dimensions of SM of knowledge and competency as main dependent variable ranging from SMK1 to SMK5.

Intellectual Capital (IC)

From the context of business, intellectual capital or IC is defined as an asset and collection of all type of informational resources, used by the firm to drive profit, targeting potential customers in the market, improving business process and creation of new products (Brooking, 1998; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Stewart and Ruckdeschel, 1998). Structural capital reflects the organizational abilities to satisfy market needs (Stewart and Ruckdeschel, 1998). Relational capital indicates the firm's ability to keep its relationship with various stakeholders (Russo and Perrini, 2010; Ametorwo, 2016). While spiritual capital refers to the amount of

spiritual knowledge and beliefs available for the business to achieve some objectives through its core employees (Verter, 2003). Present study has considered all of these dimensions of IC for strategic management of knowledge and organizational competency.

Research Methodology

This research has adopted primary research technique through quantitative method. At first, questionnaire was developed, based on the various items for human capital, structural capital, relational capital, and spiritual capital as core dimensions of IC. While SM of knowledge and competency is measured through five dimensions. After the development of questionnaire, 280 copies were distributed to the targeted respondents, working in different firms of Indonesia. After three weeks, copies of distributed questionnaires were collected. Detailed review of collected copies indicates that 38 questionnaires are found to be missing with responses, hence dropped from the sample. Overall, 242 questionnaires are found to be valid for the empirical analysis. Both descriptive and empirical methods are conducted on the sample questionnaires.

Results of the Study

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std.Dev.	Min	Max
HC1	242	4.818	1.123	1	5
HC2	242	4.583	1.076	1	5
HC3	242	4.843	1.116	1	5
HC4	242	4.008	1.275	1	5
HC5	242	4.992	1.195	1	5
SC1	242	4.678	1.175	1	5
SC2	242	2.81	1.133	1	5
SC3	242	4.764	1.137	1	5
SC4	242	4.831	1.242	1	5
SC5	242	4.583	.068	1	5
RC1	242	4.566	1.042	1	5
RC2	242	4.364	1.035	1	5
RC3	242	4.711	.141	1	5
RC4	242	2.12	1.119	1	5
RC5	242	4.55	1.124	1	5
SOC1	242	4.628	1.024	1	5
SOC2	242	4.467	.977	1	5
SOC3	242	4.483	1.019	1	5
SOC4	242	4.591	1.04	1	5
SOC5	242	4.079	1.1	1	5
SMK1	242	4.909	1.055	1	5
SMK2	242	4.554	1.104	1	5
SMK3	242	4.372	1.157	1	5
SKM4	242	4.541	1.047	1	5
SMK5	242	4.537	.947	1	5

Table 2. Reliability analysis of the study

Constructs	No of items	Cronbach Alpha
Human Capital		
HC1-HC5	5	.790
Structural Capital		
SC1-SC5	5	.842
Relational Capital		
RC1-RC5	5	.707
Spiritual Capital		
SPC1-SPC5	5	.930
Strategic Management of Knowledge		
SMK1-SMK5	5	.861

Table 3. Impact of Human Capital, Structural Capital, and Relational Capital on Strategic Management of Knowledge

(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
VARIABLES	Knowledge and competency-based strategy	Company strategy addresses knowledge and competency	Comparisons of company's strategy with competitors	Communication of Knowledge and competency Mgt. Strategy to employees	Responsibility of SMK is assigned to right employee(s)
HC1: Highly skillful employees	-0.0317 (0.0685)	-0.0220 (0.0781)	0.0770 (0.0743)	0.153** (0.0702)	0.0296 (0.0687)
HC2: highly motivated employees	0.00861 (0.0638)	0.00548 (0.0807)	0.149* (0.0788)	-0.0771 (0.0650)	0.0302 (0.0731)
HC3: higher expertise of employees	0.283*** (0.0697)	0.0390 (0.0919)	-0.1010 (0.0898)	-0.0673 (0.0826)	0.1130 (0.0808)
HC4: Training & development of employees	0.00150 (0.0408)	-0.0134 (0.0533)	-0.0645 (0.0673)	-0.0103 (0.0541)	0.0043 (0.0504)
HC5: Company's employees continuously learn from others	0.0596 (0.0659)	0.0757 (0.0898)	-0.149 (0.0990)	-0.0308 (0.0752)	-0.0213 (0.0735)
SC1: company's culture and atmosphere are supportive and comfortable	-0.0395 (0.0571)	0.0417 (0.0645)	0.1030 (0.0824)	0.0503 (0.0600)	0.0146 (0.0540)

(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
SC2: recruitment programs are comprehensive	0.148** (0.0675)	0.0873 (0.0724)	0.1260 (0.0777)	0.0658 (0.0685)	-0.0340 (0.0588)
SC3: company supports their employees	-0.0762 (0.0581)	0.203** (0.0852)	0.0900 (0.0864)	0.0484 (0.0682)	0.0667 (0.0632)
SC4: company continuously develops work processes.	0.179*** (0.0606)	-0.171*** (0.0599)	-0.0856 (0.0673)	-0.0185 (0.0566)	-0.143** (0.0586)
SC5: systems and procedures of the company support innovation	0.0246 (0.0658)	0.1240 (0.0931)	0.0184 (0.1000)	0.0269 (0.0847)	0.141* (0.0827)
RC1: currently working on joint projects	0.0868 (0.0724)	0.0821 (0.0864)	-0.0574 (0.0978)	-0.0378 (0.0815)	0.0595 (0.0871)
RC2: company has diverse distribution channels	-0.0118 (0.0657)	-0.0309 (0.0916)	0.163* (0.0966)	0.0327 (0.0810)	0.0564 (0.0853)
RC3: Outside consultation	-0.0701 (0.0657)	0.169* (0.0924)	0.0812 (0.0934)	0.276*** (0.0748)	0.0303 (0.0769)
RC4: company prides itself on being partnership-oriented	0.0026 (0.0706)	0.229** (0.0907)	0.168* (0.0925)	-0.0123 (0.0798)	0.0385 (0.0850)
RC5: strategic alliances affect company's productivity	0.257*** (0.0803)	-0.0252 (0.0840)	0.0379 (0.111)	0.271*** (0.0866)	0.1270 (0.0839)
Constant	0.677** (0.310)	0.667** (0.306)	1.196*** (0.443)	1.005*** (0.382)	1.648*** (0.397)
Observations	242	242	242	242	242
R-squared	0.495	0.345	0.181	0.298	0.224

Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4. Spiritual Capital on Strategic Management of Knowledge and Competency

(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
SPRC1: working is part of their acts of devotion to God.	0.130* (0.0747)	0.300*** (0.0810)	0.102*** (0.0042)	0.182** (0.0739)	0.224*** (0.0699)
SPRC2: organization has faith in the management team	0.100 (0.0672)	0.144* (0.0790)	0.277*** (0.0842)	0.217*** (0.0719)	0.171** (0.0770)
SPRC3: organization is more profitable due to religious belief	0.355*** (0.0684)	0.0371 (0.0736)	-0.0825 (0.0793)	0.0765 (0.0738)	0.0259 (0.0675)
SPRC4: company has religious key values	-0.00836 (0.0606)	-0.00843 (0.0659)	0.000824 (0.0772)	-0.0525 (0.0631)	0.0395 (0.0563)
SPRC5: employees are truthful	-0.0180 (0.0749)	0.102 (0.0726)	0.151* (0.0814)	0.0798 (0.0664)	0.0372 (0.0693)
Constant	1.884*** (0.343)	1.528*** (0.334)	1.852*** (0.383)	1.766*** (0.336)	1.814*** (0.323)
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Observations	242	242	242	242	242

R-squared	0.250	0.189	0.112	0.179	0.174
Note: Robust standard errors in parentheses: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1					

Discussion on Results

Table 1 depicts the findings for descriptive outcomes of study. To reflect the factor of intellectual capital, five dimensions for human capital, structural capital, relational capital and social capital are considered. All these items except SC2, RC4 have a mean score above 4 indicating that respondents are agreed with the stated queries through structural questionnaire. Deviation from the mean is minimum for SC5, following RC3. The range of responses have covered the values between 1 to 5, taking the likert scale from strongly disagree as 1 to strongly agree as 5. Range of mean score for Strategic management of knowledge CMK indicators is also above 4 on similar likert scale. These descriptive findings have given a reasonable justification for their addition in regression analysis of the study. Table 2 presents the reliability analysis through Cronbach alpha (CA) for all the selected items. As per literature context, a good score for the items to be reliable for the regression analysis should be above .70. For each of explanatory power, CA score is calculated and presented. Overall five items for HC indicates a CA score of .790, for SC CA is .842, for RC, CA value is .707, for SPC, CA value is .930, indicating a reasonable justification for the further analysis. For strategic management of knowledge SMK, overall value is .861, hence good for the empirical findings. Table 3 reflects the empirical findings for SMK and competency through human capital, structural capital and relational capital under full sample. For the fourth dimension of SMK and competency, it is observed that highly skilled employees in the business are positively and significantly associated to it. It means that level of communication for SMK and competency is depending upon highly skillful employees. More such type of employees in the business means better communication with each other for strategic management of knowledge and competency. HC3 or higher expertise of employees are mainly responsible for the knowledge and competency-based strategy in the business. This assumption is evident through coefficient of .283, significant at 1 percent level of significance. The rest of the indicator for human capital are found to be insignificantly associated to SMK and competency. For structural capital, it is observed that comprehensive recruitment programs are developing knowledge and competency-based strategies in the business firms. while support from the company to its employees (SC3) is significantly associated to those strategies of the company which addresses knowledge and competency. The factor of SC4 or continuously development of work process is directly associated to SMK1 and SMK2. However, it is observed that more development of work process in the business can adversely affect the factor of responsibility of SMK is assigned to right employees. The factor of relational capital or RC4 covers the title that company prides itself on being partnership-oriented indicates its direct impact on knowledge and competency-based strategy and its comparison with the

competitors. Meanwhile, the factor of strategic alliance company affects the company affects its productivity or RC5 indicates more knowledge and competency-based strategy. Similarly, it is found that RC5 has a direct association with the communication of knowledge and competency management strategy to employees. For spiritual capital (SPRC), five items are added in the model and separate findings are presented under table 4. It is observed that working attitude of the employees as devotion to God or SPRC1 indicates significant and positive influence on all five dimensions of SMK and competency. For SPRC2 (organizational faith in management team) indicates significant influence on SMK2 to SMK4, except SMK1. This positive influence implies that spiritual capital playing its significant role in the business firm. Due to religious belief, business is more profitable is directly impacting on knowledge and competency-based strategy. In addition, truthfulness of employees is significantly and positively impacting on comparison of company's strategy with the competitors. Rest of the items are insignificantly associated to the spiritual capital.

Conclusion

This study has intended to examine core factors of intellectual capital like human, structural, relational and spiritual on strategic management of knowledge and competency by business firms. Study is conducted in the region of Indonesia through data collection from the core employees of various firms, having managerial experience. A sample of 242 respondents through questionnaire approach is collected. All items are measured on the likert scale of five points, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. For human, structural, relational and spiritual capital five items of each are added in the questionnaire, extracted from existing literature. For SMK, five items are representing the culture of knowledge based strategic management and competency in the business. Both descriptive and regression findings are presented and reasonable discussion for the results is conducted. It is observed that factors like Highly skillful employees are leading towards more communication of knowledge and competency management strategy to employees. Besides, study has several limitations. At first, sample has not specified the industrial distribution which can be viewed among the major limitations. Other factors like interaction of strategic management for improved business performance is missing part in this study. Besides, demographic impact on the relationship between SMK and intellectual capital is also not under observation in present research. Future studies can be implemented while addressing these limitations.

References

- Ametorwo A.M., 2016, *Managing Work Family Conflict among Female Entrepreneurs in Ghana for Development*, "International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies", 3(1).
Brooking A., 1998, *Intellectual capital*, Cengage Learning EMEA.

- Cabrilo S., Dahms S., 2018, *How strategic knowledge management drives intellectual capital to superior innovation and market performance*, "Journal of knowledge management", 22(3).
- Choo C.W., Bontis N., 2002, *The strategic management of intellectual capital and organizational knowledge*, Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Claver-Cortés E., Zaragoza-Sáez P., Úbeda-García M., Marco-Lajara B., García-Lillo F., 2018, *Strategic knowledge management in subsidiaries and MNC performance. The role of the relational context*, "Journal of knowledge management", 22(5).
- EmenikeKalu O., Obasi R., 2016, *Long-run relationship between marketing of bank services & the performance of deposit money banks in Nigeria*, "International Journal of Economics, Business & Management Studies", 3(1).
- Gold A.H., Malhotra A., Segars A.H., 2001, *Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective*, "Journal of management information systems", 18(1).
- Haseeb M., Abidin I.S.Z., Hye Q.M.A., Hartani N.H., 2018, *The impact of renewable energy on economic well-being of Malaysia: Fresh evidence from auto regressive distributed lag bound testing approach*, "International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy", 9(1).
- Ichijo K., Nonaka I., 2006, *Knowledge creation and management: New challenges for managers*, Oxford university press.
- Jordão R.V.D., Novas J.C., 2017, *Knowledge management and intellectual capital in networks of small-and medium-sized enterprises*, "Journal of Intellectual capital", 18(3).
- Kianto A., Ritala P., Spender J.C., Vanhala M., 2014, *The interaction of intellectual capital assets and knowledge management practices in organizational value creation*, "Journal of Intellectual capital", 15(3).
- Lari L.R.A., NYangweso P.M., Rono L.J., 2017, *Determinants of Technical Inefficiency of Saccos in Kenya: A Net Operating Cash Flows Output Slack Analysis*, "Asian Journal of Economics and Empirical Research", 4(2).
- Makanga R.O., Paul S., 2017, *Influence of strategic management practices on performance of Kenya power and lighting company ltd, Nairobi County, Kenya*, "Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management", 4(4).
- Markhaichuk M., Zhuckovskaya I., 2019, *The spread of the regional intellectual capital: the case of the Russian Federation*, *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 10(1).
- Maziku P., 2016, *Effects of Non Tariff Barriers on Maize Trade in Mbozi and Momba Districts of Tanzania*, "International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies", 3(1).
- McKiernan K.A., D'angelo B.R., Kaufman J.N., Binder J.R., 2006, *Interrupting the "stream of consciousness": an fMRI investigation*, *Neuroimage*, 29(4).
- McKiernan P., 2006, *Exploring environmental context within the history of strategic management*, "International Studies of Management & Organization", 36(3).
- Nahapiet J., Ghoshal S., 1998, *Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage*, *Academy of management review*, 23(2).
- Russo A., Perrini F., 2010, *Investigating stakeholder theory and social capital: CSR in large firms and SMEs*, "Journal of Business ethics", 91(2).
- Salem M.A., Shawtari F.A., Shamsudin M.F., Hussain H.I., 2016, *The relation between stakeholders' integration and environmental competitiveness*, "Social Responsibility Journal", 12(4).
- Santoro G., Vrontis D., Thrassou A., Dezi L., 2018, *The Internet of Things: Building a knowledge management system for open innovation and knowledge management capacity*, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 136.
- Snyman R., Kruger C.J., 2004, *The interdependency between strategic management and strategic knowledge management*, "Journal of knowledge management", 8(1).
- Stewart T., Ruckdeschel C., 1998, *Intellectual capital: The new wealth of organizations*, *Performance Improvement*, 37(7).

- Stukalina Y., 2014, *Strategic management of higher education institutions*, Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai, 70.
- Tyagi S., Siddiqui S., 2017, *Yield Curve and Momentum Effects in Monthly US Equity Returns: Some Nonparametric Evidence*, "Asian Journal of Economics and Empirical Research", 4(2).
- Verter B., 2003, *Spiritual capital: Theorizing religion with Bourdieu against Bourdieu*, Sociological theory, 21(2).
- Wang Q., Sharma U., Davey H., 2016, *Intellectual capital disclosure by Chinese and Indian information technology companies: A comparative analysis*, "Journal of Intellectual capital", 17(3).
- Wiig K.M., 1997, *Integrating intellectual capital and knowledge management*, Long range planning, 30(3).
- Wiig K.M., 1999, *What future knowledge management users may expect*, "Journal of knowledge management", 3(2).
- Winter S., Teece D., 1998, *Knowledge and competence as strategic assets*, The strategic management of intellectual capital, 187.
- Zhou A.Z., Fink D., 2003, *The intellectual capital web: a systematic linking of intellectual capital and knowledge management*, "Journal of Intellectual capital", 4(1).

STRATEGICZNE ZARZĄDZANIE WIEDZĄ ORGANIZACJI I KOMPETENCJAMI POPRZEZ KAPITAŁ INTELEKTUALNY

Streszczenie: Zarządzanie wiedzą organizacji i kompetencjami pracowników jest postrzegane jako klucz do sukcesu. Jednak znaczenie kapitału intelektualnego w strategicznym zarządzaniu wiedzą i kompetencjami organizacyjnymi ma ograniczoną uwagę w literaturze. Celem niniejszego opracowania jest zbadanie wpływu kapitału intelektualnego na strategiczne zarządzanie wiedzą i kompetencjami z kontekstu Indonezji. Próbę 242 respondentów zebrano za pomocą opracowanego kwestionariusza. Z kontekstu metodologicznego wynika, że w badaniu zastosowano analizę opisową i regresyjną. Zauważono, że istnieje znaczący związek między różnymi elementami kapitału intelektualnego i strategicznym zarządzaniem wiedzą i kompetencjami. Ustalenia są w znacznym stopniu sugerowane decydentom i decydentom strategicznym w biznesie i danej branży. Kluczowe ograniczenia obejmują ograniczoną próbkę i niestosowanie analizy przekrojowej.

Słowa kluczowe: kapitał intelektualny, kapitał ludzki, kapitał strukturalny, kapitał duchowy, zarządzanie strategiczne, Indonezja.

通过知识资本对组织知识和竞争力进行战略管理

摘要:管理组织知识和员工能力是成功的关键。然而，知识资本对知识和组织能力战略管理的重要性在文献中受到的关注有限。本研究的目的是研究知识资本对印度尼西亚背景下知识和能力战略管理的影响。通过制定的调查问卷收集了242名受访者的样本。从方法论的角度来看，研究遵循描述性和回归分析。据观察，知识资本的各种项目与知识和能力的战略管理之间存在着重要的联系。向业务和相关行业的决策者和战略决策者提出了明显的调查结果。关键限制包括有限的样品和不应用横截面分析。

关键词:智力资本，人力资本，结构资本，精神资本，战略管理，印度尼西亚

© 2019. This work is published under
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (the “License”).
Notwithstanding the ProQuest Terms and Conditions, you may use this
content in accordance with the terms of the License.