

Intellectual Capital Assessment Models in Clusters: A Literature Review

Driss Tsouli

Received: 9 December 2016 Accepted: 1 January 2017 Published: 15 January 2017

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to review the literature on intellectual capital in clusters in order to identify and compare the main models to measure at the cluster level. A systemic literature review was carried out using the most important bibliographic database Scopus and the most important journal on intellectual capital: journal of intellectual capital. The search covered the period from 2004 to 2016.

Index terms— cluster, intellectual capital, assessment models.

1 Introduction

In the new economics of competition, the economic map of the world is dominated by what it called clusters. Clusters are geographic concentrations of interconnected companies and institutions in a particular field [14]. Clusters impact competitiveness inside countries as well as outside of national borders. Clusters are an international fact that arises in Japan, the USA, Germany, Netherlands, Finland, Sweden, and other countries. That's mean there is a possible relation between development and clusters. Therefore, clusters lead to a new way of thinking about location, challenging much of the conventional wisdom about how companies should be configured, how institutions such as universities can contribute to competitive success, and how governments can promote economic development and prosperity [14].

On the other hand, intellectual capital has become the most important resource for value creation and competitive advantage. Intellectual capital research has mostly concentrated on companies [2], and beside modest research at regions or nations level.

The first studies related to IC assessment on clusters have done by J.L. Hervás and J.I. Dalmau in order to construct an Intellectual Capital Cluster Index (ICCI). Later, some practitioners and scholars were interested in IC in clusters. A literature review was conducted to identify the works related to IC at the clusters level and obtain an overview of intangibles. The specific objectives of this paper are: to identify the main advances in IC in clusters studies; to identify the main models developed to measure IC at the clusters level; and to characterize and compare the models. The research questions are: What advances have been made in the last decade in knowledge about IC at the clusters level? How is IC measured at the clusters level? What kind of indicators, variables, and components are being used? What are the main differences among models? What can be learned for future policies? The paper is structured as follows. The second section summarizes the conceptual framework and the underlying theories for IC analysis. Section 3 presents the methodology applied. Section 4 presents the models analyzed and initial findings and compares the main characteristics of the models. Section 5 offers some conclusions.

2 II.

3 Clusters and Intellectual Capital Foundations

The point of departure of clusters intangibles has been the Marshall's project, under different names as social complexity [10], non-traded interdependencies [17] [16], or community of people. Consequently, nothing is new except the IC definition and the formal model to assess and value all these intangibles.

All these intangibles have been integrated in three basic elements identified in clusters [3]. first, the specialization in one or in a few stage of production process which leads to a higher productivity. Second, the milieu [7], which

can be devised on two aspects: culture (knowledge, competences, attitudes, high regard for risk and profit) and infrastructure (land availability, communications, social services, services to the firms, "local banking"). third, the network which is formed by linkage (forward and backward) which provides a competitive advantage (customer relationship, corporate image, connections).

From another perspective, Porter's work [12] [14] on clusters led to know the forces like : special infrastructures available in the territory (skilled labour pool, universities, R&D centers, etc.); related and supporting industries, complementing core industry processes; demanding conditions, because a strong, trend-setting local market in quantity and quality helps local firms to anticipate global trends; and firm strategy, structure and rivalry, which forces local firms to move beyond basic country advantages to search for competitive advantages. All the expressed forces provided extraordinary conditions which support firm competitiveness and value creation in the territory and they constituted an intellectual capital source.

Consequently, the linkage between firms, firms and institutions such as public R&D centers, universities, drive to arise the intellectual capital inside clusters.

For this reason, some scholars tried to build the models for assessing IC in clusters for every cluster elements which act as an IC sources for the value creation.

4 ? Linked Industries

Porter's work [12] [13] [14] considered the connected industries more specifically the auxiliary industry provide a more efficient basis to supply inputs into the value creation system. Therefore, the auxiliary industry is a knowledge mechanism which contributes to the cluster IC stock providing to the rest of the value chain innovations, interactions and also information flows to the rest of the system's components.

5 ? Institutions and Infrastructure

Porter [12] pointed that the importance of institutions is not only their existence, but the connectivity and the interaction with other cluster parts to contribute to upgrade the cluster's knowledge stock. For example University programs usually include specific and special courses linked to the located industries, constituting a source of skilled and trained labour, as well as vocational centres. Public R&D institutes, jointly with universities' cooperation, carry out cluster-specific research to expand the knowledge and technology useful and required in the area, frequently taking the form of formal contracts between located firms and the institutes themselves with the aim to enlarge firm's technological capabilities.

6 ? Human Resources

The most important implication in a cluster is refers to the presence of a community of people. Porter [12] also mentioned in his model the importance of specialized human resources on cluster industries. People must be educated in specific cluster university courses and they could be trained in clusters requirement by specifying center programs offered by regional authorities. Another important point is the social capital aspects (trust, common language, objectives and assumptions, local vocabulary and mutual understandings, among others) which are associated with high-quality information flows and tacit knowledge held by workers and managers available in the area [18].

7 Firm Strategy

For Porter, 1990, Clusters firms should not only take advantage from the territorial resources but create successful configurations of its own value chains. Firm strategy builds competitiveness and thus creates value. That means, not only territorial resources are crucial but also the firms' actions. Without upgrading firms' strategies territorial resources cannot be interrelated in self-firms value chains. Similarly, [8] also recognize the fact that "the orientation and sophistication of the strategies undertaken by firms in the clusters ultimately determine the cluster's wealth creation capacity".

8 ? Linkages

Knowledge creation and transmission mechanisms imply to strengthen linkages between the different agents located in the cluster such as clients, suppliers and other related industries through informal and formal collaborations and relationships [3] [6] . Similarly Porter's concept of fit explains the way in which activities are connected each other in the value chain rather than working isolated [11].

9 ? Economic Performance

Economic performance represents the profitability and success achieved by the cluster as a whole, mixing financial such as returns or productivity and non-financial performance indicators specially connected to customer and market matters.

10 III.

11 Research Method

The study presents a comprehensive review of the articles addressing the IC-clusters assessment models published from 2004 to 2015, the population to be studied included articles that were: ? Empirical, because practice is the origin of IC research [9]. ? Published in peer-reviewed journals, which guarantees a high level of quality. ? Published from 2004 to 2015, as the seminal paper in this field of research was published in 2004 by AinoPöyhönenAnssiSmedlund. ? Written in English, since English is the official language of knowledge The selection of papers was conducted using the primary academic databases of Scopus an initial search of the Scopus, (title, abstract and keywords field) was conducted using the keywords "intellectual capital" and "clusters". The results obtained (63 in Scopus) were then refined by analysing their titles. This step yielded a total of 6 articles. And the final decision was about the inclusion of these 6 articles.

12 IV. ICC: Main Models

The literature presents several models to measure IC at the cluster level using different methods to identify intangibles. In general, two approaches were identified (Table I).the first originated in the study of intangibles Ofclusters and is promoted mainly by academics. The second, developed by international organizations and business schools, aims to study competitiveness, innovative capacity, and development not only at cluster level but at the whole regional level.

Table I Shows the models selected from the literature review for this study. The first group includes the models derived from the taxonomy presented by Hervas-Oliver (2004), such as, networks, Institutions, infrastructure, Human resources, Firm strategy and Economic performance. Which seek to identify ICC, using indicators of intangibles that support regional growth. These models include Organizationalcapital,Human Capital, Social Capital, and the local and international relationships.

International organization models simply combine the vision of intangibles with the traditional economic growth approach. The results of these models are far from ICC principles.

Tables II and III show the main characteristics of each evaluation system. While academic models determine IC as an independent factor using indicators of intangibles, the international organization models use indicators of intangible and tangible assets to determine competitiveness, innovation capacity, or development of countries without identifying total IC.

13 Conclusions

Intellectual capital traditionally focused on micro-level and less on macro-level needs to be extended to the clusters. Sustainable and effective cluster economic growth occurs when all located agents (industries, institutions, and other actors) work formal or informally in the same direction and with shared goals.Although several models are available to measure intangibles at the cluster level, international organization models are the most widely used because policy makers are not yet familiar with the concept of IC and they are not aware of the importance of intangibles in competitiveness.

The main differences between the two approaches are the objectives and the conceptual framework .The academic models seek to determine ICC directly, , while the international organization models focus directly on capacity for growth or development without identifying IC or IC components or cluster characteristics. ^{1 2}

¹© 2017 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²BIntellectual Capital Assessment Models in Clusters: A Literature Review

I

Models	Authors	Organization
Models developed by researchers (academic models)		
theoretical model of the dynamics of intellectual capital creation in regional clusters and networks	AinoPoyhonen and AnssiSmedlund inter-organizational	University of Technology, Finland
The Intellectual Capital Cluster Index (ICCI)	J.L. Hervas and J.I. Dalmau	Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain
Models developed by international organizations		
Knowledge Assessment Methodology (KAM)	World Bank (WB) [20]	
Global Innovation Index (GII)	INSEAD[4]	
Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)	World Economic Forum (WEF) [19]	
World Competitiveness Index (WCI)	International Institute for Management Development (IMD) [5]	

Figure 1: Table I :

II

	the dynamics of intellectual capital creation in regional clusters and inter-organizational networks	The Intellectual Capital Cluster Index (ICCI)
Models		
Authors	AinoPoyhonen and AnssiSmedlund	J.L. Hervas and J.I. Dalmau
Assessment objective	Knowledge creation	value creation
Main aggregated indicators	Knowledge and competence Relationships Information flow Management and leadership method	networks, Institutions and infrastructure, Human resources, Firm strategy Economic performance
IC components	Relational capital, human capital, organizational capital	Relational capital, human capital, social capital organizational capital
Assets	Intangible	Tangible and intangible
Methodology	Regional networks are presented as the networks of production, development and innovation in the region	An ICC index is determined. The indicators are added according to the relative importance of each one

Figure 2: Table II :

III

Organization	World Bank (WB)	INSEAD		World Economic Forum (WEF)		International Institute for Management Development (IMD)
Assessment objective	Knowledge Economy Index (KEI) and Knowledge Index (KI)	Innovation Institutions, HC and research, Infrastructure, market sophistication and business sophistication. innovation output: scientific outputs and creative outputs	Input:	Competitiveness		Competitiveness
Main aggregated indicators				Institutions, Infrastructure, Macroeconomic environment, health and basic education, higher education and training, goods market efficiency, labor market efficiency, financial market technological readiness, market size, business sophistication and Innovation	Economic development,	performance and business efficiency
	Not explicit, but are deduced:	Explicitly only HC. Also are deduced: RC, SC,		Not explicit, but are deduced: HC, RC, SC,	Not explicit, but are deduced: HC, RC, SC,	
IC components	HC, RC, SC, Renewal Capital, Market Capital, and Process Capital	deduced: RC, SC, Renewal Capital, Market Capital, and Process Capital		Renewal Capital, Market Capital and Process Capital	Renewal Capital, Process Capital	Market Capital, and
Assets	Intangibles	Intangibles and Tangibles together		Intangibles and tangibles together	Intangibles	

This study has some limitations due to the wide dispersion of information related to IC and clusters. Therefore, there is probably more information on IC at the cluster level, although the literature reviewed is the most often cited and recognized by leading authors.

- [Porter ()] 'Clusters and the new economics of competition'. M Porter . *Harvard Business Review* 1998. 76 (6) p. .
- [Keeble and Wilkinson ()] 'Collective learning and knowledge development in the evolution of regional cluster of high technology SMEs in Europe'. D Keeble , F Wilkinson . *Regional Studies* 1999. 33 p. .
- [Smedlund and Po"yho"nen ()] 'Intellectual capital creation in regions: a knowledge system approach'. A Smedlund , A Po"yho"nen . *Intellectual Capital for Communities: Nations, Regions and Cities*, A Bounfour, L Edvinsson (ed.) (New York, NY) 2004. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- [Petty and Guthrie ()] 'Intellectual capital literature review: measurement, reporting and management'. R Petty , J Guthrie . *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 2000. 1 (2) p. .
- [Bank (2012)] *Knowledge assessment methodology*, World Bank . www.worldbank.org/kam 2012. 2012. January 10, 2017.
- [Bontis ()] 'National intellectual capital index: the benchmarking of Arab countries'. N Bontis . *Journal of Intellectual Capital* 2004. 5 (1) p. .
- [Porter ()] M Porter . *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analysing Industries and Competitors*, (New York, NY) 1980. Free Press.
- [Brusco (1986)] 'Small firms and industrial districts: the experience of Italy'. S Brusco . *Economia Internazionale* 1986. 2/3/4. 39 p. .
- [Maillat ()] *SMEs, innovation and territorial development*, D Maillat . 1989. Arco. (paper presented at the European Summer Institute of the Regional Science Association)
- [Porter ()] *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, M Porter . 1990. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- [Storper and Scott (ed.) ()] *The geographical foundations and social regulation of flexible production complexes*, M Storper , A Scott . Wolch, J. and Dear, M. (ed.) 1989. Boston, MA: Unwin and Hyman. p. . (The Power of Geography: How Territory Shapes Social Life Social Reproduction)
- [The Global Competitiveness Report World Economic Forum Geneva ()] 'The Global Competitiveness Report'. *World Economic Forum Geneva* 2010. 2010-2011. (WEF)
- [Dutta ()] 'The Global Innovation Index'. S Dutta . *Accelerating Growth and Development* 2011. 2011.
- [Bellandi ()] 'The industrial district in Marshall'. M Bellandi . *Small Firms and Industrial Districts in*, E Goodman, J Bamford (ed.) (Italy, Routledge, London) 1989.
- [Storper ()] 'The limits of the globalization: technology districts and international trade'. M Storper . *Economic Geography* 1992. 68 p. .
- [Martins and Viedma ()] *The region's intellectual capital benchmarking system: tapping into a region's economic growth potential from an intellectual capital view*, B Martins , J M Viedma . 2004. Toronto. (working paper presented at Knowledge Management and Intellectual Capital International Conference)
- [Piore and Sabel ()] *The Second Industrial Divide*, M Piore , C Sabel . 1984. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- [Uzzi ()] 'The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations'. B Uzzi . *American Sociological Review* 1996. 61 p. .
- [Porter ()] 'Toward a dynamic theory of strategy'. M Porter . *Strategic Management Journal* 1991. 12 p. .
- [World Competitiveness Yearbook (WCY), IMD, Lausanne available at IMD (2012)] 'World Competitiveness Yearbook (WCY), IMD, Lausanne available at'. www.imd.org/research/publications/wcy/index.cfm IMD 2012. January 13, 2017.