ENCUENTROS | Revista de Ciencias Humanas, Teoría Social y Pensamiento Crítico pp: 436-449

THE LOCUS OF INNOVATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT: CAN AN ENTERPRISE CONTRIBUTE TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS, JUST FROM INSIDE? LITERATURE REVIEW

El eje de la innovación y la gestión del conocimiento: ¿Puede una empresa contribuir a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible, solo desde dentro? Revisión bibliográfica

Rafael Emiliano Apolinario Quintana
Universidad de Guayaquil, Ecuador.
rafael.apolinarioqu@ug.edu.ec
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1719-5425

Eva María de Lourdes Loaiza Massuh
Universidad de Guayaquil, Ecuador.
eva.loaizam@ug.edu.ec
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4041-8597

Martha Graciela Rodríguez Donoso
Universidad de Guayaquil, Ecuador.
martha.rodriguezd@ug.edu.ec
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5774-7760

Daniel Eduardo Guevara Sánchez
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Perú, Perú.
dguevaras@pucp.pe
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6374-8062

Humberto Pedro Segarra Jaime
Universidad de Guayaquil, Ecuador.
humberto.segarraj@ug.edu.ec
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3946-952X

Este trabajo está depositado en Zenodo:
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17399499

ABSTRACT

To analyze the importance of the locus of innovation and resource-based knowledge management as a variable to contribute to Sustainable Development Goals among small and medium-sized enterprises. The paper tries to open a debate about thinking from situation and its real dynamics, in order to understand social responsibility efficiency. Literature is reviewed from different sources and experiences. We concluded that there is little written on this subject, while it is necessary to help a general narrative for enterprises who want to address innovation competences to social responsibility from a different point of depart. For this it is proposed to understand tools for prospecting complexity in the situation level, outside the organization.

Keywords: knowledge management, innovation, locus-situation, Social Responsibility, Sustainable Development Goals.

RESUMEN

Este trabajo analiza la importancia del enfoque en la innovación y la gestión del conocimiento basada en recursos como variable que contribuye a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible en las pequeñas y medianas empresas. Se busca abrir un debate sobre el análisis de la situación y su dinámica real para comprender la eficacia de la responsabilidad social. Se revisa la literatura de diversas fuentes y experiencias. Se concluye que existe poca bibliografía sobre este tema, y que es necesario contribuir a una narrativa general para las empresas que desean integrar las competencias de innovación en la responsabilidad social desde una perspectiva diferente. Para ello, se propone comprender herramientas que permitan analizar la complejidad a nivel situacional, fuera de la organización.

Palabras claves: Gestión del conocimiento, innovación, contexto, responsabilidad social, Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible.

RECIBIDO: 17/02/2025 ACEPTADO: 17/05/2025

INTRODUCTION: MANAGEMENT OF AN ENTERPRISE AND THE MANAGEMENT OF SOCIAL CHANGE.

In Management Studies literature it is easy to find statements about the importance Knowledge Management on efficiency and to increasing opportunities for the organization goals (normally, an enterprise). Individual knowledge sharing between teams and within the organization is introduced as the organization's most valuable resource and a critical resource for achieving competitive advantage (Dayan et al., 2017). Consequently, a high level of knowledge use to indicate that an organization is more productive when it reduces costs and increases sales in the process, while innovation intervenes within a company (Santoro et al., 2017). In this sense, Knowledge Management (KM) and executive capacity for innovation (ECI) are related to social ties, shared goals and social trust, and axiological representation of the structural, cognitive and relational dimensions of an organization's social capital (Daniel & Huang, 2019; Ganguly et al., 2019).

KM and innovation are very well linked on literature. Organizations with strong capabilities on KM are associated to more likely to successfully pursue innovation (Abouzeedan et al., 2013). Thus, the elemental quality of innovative ideas can come from sharing the quality of knowledge within companies (Robbins & O'Gorman, 2016). Therefore, KM is a systematic approach or strategy to find, understand and use knowledge to generate value that increases the efficiency and productivity of internal resources (Ngah & Wong, 2020).

KM is close related, in these global times, to the ability to innovate and respond to rapidly changing conditions (Liao & Barnes, 2015). In other words, companies, especially small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), because of their structure and general characteristics, resources, operation processes and performance, have major barriers that make it difficult for them to act effectively (Garcia et al., 2014), but they compensate this lacks in directing their human capital management through knowledge transfer (Kaur et al., 2019), as if they were closed biological organisms which tend to improve survival in a complex entourage.

Al this literature, as can it be detected, thinks on the use of KM from inside the organization, even to intervene in social complexity to produce social responsibility. In other words, it is very difficult to find this close relation between enterprise innovation and social responsibility from resources outside the enterprise, mostly because a large amount of the literature is focused on efficiency, profitability and competition of the very organization. This paper will explore the relationship between KM, innovation and social responsibility, in order to open a debate about the importance of setting the *locus* of innovation outside the enterprise.

The traditional idea of Knowledge Management (KM)

KM comes was nested into the idea, also nested in the origins of natural sciences, that all organism depends on the inner locus of control.

This theory holds the assumption that an individual's earnings depend on the profitability of the firm, where the organization generates business and operational activity resulting in profitable hiring (Chauvel & Depress, 2002). In this sense, KM converges on the implementation of formal processes that reflect performance through the resource-based theory of knowledge (Beckett et al., 2000; Shin et al., 2001; Lee & Wong, 2015). Resource theory is determined by all that knowledge, both tacit and explicit, internal and external, *that*

is owned by organizations and suggests that resources and capabilities are valuable, difficult to imitate, and non-substitutable, which leads organizations in the long run to success (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; De Gooijer, 2000).

Therefore, KM can be presented as a process of acquiring, storing, understanding, sharing, and implementing knowledge that is transmitted with strategies *into the organization* (Ngah & Wong, 2019). Simultaneously (Lee & Wong, 2015; Shrafat, 2017), express that there are needs based on the capabilities of organizations to facilitate and improve KM activities by analyzing their *inner* factors.

But, paradoxically, most of the literature perceive that KM models are promoted through strategies, policies, processes, traditions, and procedures, which are adaptable to organizational sectors due to their complexity (Meier, 2011). Likewise, as part of the dilemmas, Vasconcelos (2008) maintains that in KM it is mentioned within the transfer and conversion of tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge or vice versa. For his part, Darroch (2005) indicates that KM can be defined as a coordinated tool that organizations can manage using resources from different outcomes contributing to innovating and developing their projects (Liao & Barnes, 2015). This is critical, as these resources become useless in the face of staff resistance to using them (Hanisch et al., 2009; Robbins & O'Gorman, 2016), proving that inner misunderstanding of external complexities is an usual disadvantage for innovation.

As it is shown, most of the literature on KM seems more dedicated to the organization's internal interest. Therefore, the KM achievements can be represented by centrally entropic strategies, measured by values such as efficiency, competitiveness, long-term vision, and adaptability, which were also designed from inside. All of this clearly implies the desire to increase economic revenue and thereby bring about change: that is the rational play of an enterprise. But, somehow and paradoxically, it is not usually expressed the other way around, that is, based on the desire to bring about social change and, for this, to contribute to the social change purpose.

It is of interest to this paper to understand that the energy dedicated to the social change is, in and of itself, the very energy of the company: Since its productive or commercial success always occurs outside the company, not within, all business success presupposes the organization's ability to bring somehow about social change. But it is not normally measured, since what is traditionally of interest is measuring the commercial or political return, as if the enterprise were a closed biological organism. It makes more difficult to receive and to understand the changes occurred outside the company. By focusing only on entropic energy, the company fails to understand one aspect of its effort.

Social responsibility and social economic entrepreneurship

Always, not giving in to the mere temptation of utilizing entropic energy is, itself, to speak of social responsibility. For so, more entropic energy, means less social responsibility. But, on the contrary, the entropic energy of the enterprises makes social responsibility to be a derivation from the enterprise own rationality. This also makes that social responsibility become a sort of expression of social care from the organization to the social reality. If the *locus* of the company doesn't change, corporate social responsibility becomes just an extension of its achievements. We argue that what it makes difficult to an organization to change its *locus*, or to have several *locus*, is that it would imply the falling of the rational sense of the organization, inside the perception of the internal staff.

When a company, organization, entrepreneurship, SME, or no matter which kind or private organization, wants to achieve social change, for example, through Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), it is logic to think that the rational interplay must change from the dynamics of the market to the dynamics of the social situation. If KM and innovation are still in the locus of the entropic energy resources, it would condemn the chosen policies or strategies to sacrifice a big amount of situational knowledge, mandatory for the project efficiency possibilities.

This is a logical result of KM own statements: In order to highlight the importance of understanding and strengthening the relationship between knowledge management (KM) and executive capacity for innovation (CEI) in SMEs, with a view to meeting the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), situation is a must. Knowledge sharing from any useful source, internal or external, is a crucial resource for competitive advantage, driving productivity, cost reduction, and innovation, essential for organizational growth and sustainability (Dayan et al., 2017; Santoro et al., 2017). KM and CIS are linked to social capital in its structural, cognitive, and relational dimensions, which foster cooperation and trust in the organization (Daniel & Huang, 2019; Ganguly et al., 2019). Although SMEs face barriers due to limited resources (Garcia et al., 2014), knowledge empowerment can turn these constraints into strategic advantages (Kaur et al., 2019). Effective knowledge management is also a key predictor of innovation (Abouzeedan et al., 2013) and effective prospection, contributing to long-term value and sustainability (Robbins & O'Gorman, 2016; Pereira et al., 2018).

Social and social economic entrepreneurships

Inside Management Studies literature, there is some examples to consider a way against traditional concepts, on the topic of social change. It would be not fair to open a debate without highlighting these management experiences. Probably the most important among them is the idea of social economical entrepreneurship.

The role of so-called social and economic entrepreneurship is once again provoking transformations in the history of global capitalism over the last 100 years. Emerging economies have been fueled by these social forces and have portrayed processes already familiar from the cycles of mercantilism-capitalism, from Renaissance Venice, 17th-century Dutch capitalism, the English Industrial and Financial Revolution, and 20th-century American industrial-technological modernism, to the present day, dominated by transversal, global, speculative relationships and innovation. Entrepreneurship in these societies is not only economic but also political, humanitarian, and cultural, since it stems from the same principle as economic entrepreneurship: it is dedicated to remaking the social fabric of its received environment.

Entrepreneurs not only tend to understand complexity well, but they also like it. They are hysterical or obsessive enough to ignore the common risks others face and set their sights on the future. They use their intelligence to recognize when dynamism offers an opportunity and when to circumvent what everyone else sees as an obstacle. They do it for the pleasure of proving others wrong, or they do it because they are people with fixed ideas who are unhappy with new ideas of caution and risk (Castro Aniyar, 2022).

In other words, entrepreneurs demonstrate a particular intelligence, organized by very rigid emotional structures that make it very difficult for them to be anything other than an entrepreneur. Such is their emotional rigidity that they must bend the things of the world to fit into it. Of course,

not all emotional rigidity produces entrepreneurship, nor does every entrepreneur possess such rigidity. But the relationship between entrepreneurship and social transformation is marked by this persistent, confident, positive, astute, and often bold attitude, in which the goals of anticipating and transforming complexity do not easily dissolve into social inertia.

For all these reasons, tying commitments to the efforts and results of entrepreneurship—that is, to the possibility of fostering change and evolution—is also a race against time for banality (Castro Aniyar, 2022).

This is why this research limits entrepreneurship to authors who have sought to rigorously define it from the entrepreneurial experience itself. Fairbanks and Lindsay understood it in 1997 as an original form of entrepreneurship, but by no means a formula that ignores the environment in which it operates. For peripheral entrepreneurship, especially in Latin America, beyond the specific objectives of their businesses:

"Its goal has to be to improve the competitive environment and to find ways to learn about sophisticated consumers so that it might provide them with unique value. At the same time, the private sector [constituted by private firms and entrepreneurs] need to help build trust within the country, both within the private sector and between the private sector and the government; to work with the government to build an efficient system of justice that protects investment and innovation and tangible and intangible property; and finally and perhaps most important, to develop learning mechanisms that continually test and replenish frames of reference so that the country develops rules of behavior consistent with worldwide consumer and competitors trends" (Fairbanks and Lindsay, 1997: 253)

Dees, Emerson and Economy define it rather from the perspective of its social potential: "Entrepreneurs are innovative, opportunity oriented, resourceful, value-creating change agents." More precisely, social entrepreneurship is derived:

> *"Social entrepreneurs seek out opportunities to improve society and take action. They attack the underlying causes of problems rather than simply treating symptoms. And, although they may act locally, their actions have the very real potential to stimulate global improvements in their chosen arenas..." (Dees, Emerson, and Economy, 2002: xxx-xxxi).*

Bornstein and Davis, linked to the emblematic ventures of Yunus and the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, define social entrepreneurship as follows:

> *"...a process by which citizens build or transform institutions to advance solutions to social problems, such as poverty, illness, illiteracy, environmental destruction, human rights abuses, and corruption, in order to make life better for many" (Bornstein and Davis, 2010: 1).*

This is a very broad definition, which further reveals the militant side of entrepreneurship as a form of political participation *in extenso*. However, they also point to the importance of the environment when they identify three stages of social entrepreneurship:

Stage 1.0, which produces the identification of people, processes, and ideas and pools them toward common goals.

Stage 2.0, which includes input from business strategies to build sustainable, high-impact ventures.

Stage 3.0, which recognizes that the potential for change transcends the boundaries of individual founders and original institutions.

Regarding the latter, they include a fundamental idea for the idea of interdependence: "It recognizes that social entrepreneurship is contagious" (Bornstein and Davis, 2010: xx). Stage 3.0 looks to forge stronger

linkages across cultural and disciplinary boundaries "particularly with business and government, and facilitate the rapid circulation and sharing of solutions at the global level" (Bornstein and Davis, 2010: xxii).

The social and economic entrepreneurship concept highlights an idea more ecological of the organization than the traditional social responsibility approach, although it is included in it. This idea does not think on inner resources to innovate social change outside the organization, but starts from outside to recognize situation and conjunctures, an puts innovation from this point of depart.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE RESOURCE-BASED KNOWLEDGE AND THE THREE CLOCKS THEORY

The conception of KM is fed by the perspective of resource-based knowledge theory and ECI based on dynamic capabilities theory (Beijerse, 2000; Teece et al., 1997). In this way, KM is described as mandatory within the work environment where several factors are involved, such as culture, strategies, infrastructure, and business systems (Lee & Wong, 2015). So also, ECI is focused on incremental improvement, strategic revitalization, and organizational capabilities that require agile and motivated executives to manage efficient and effective operational relationships (Kearney et al., 2018). But, in order to better understand social change, and also to understand social complexity, it is necessary to understand the timing and the patterns where social change can be produced. Nowadays, these approaches are consistently operated by the dynamic theory of capabilities and the Three Clocks (or Gears, according to the translation) Theory.

In this sense, the resource-based knowledge theory the dynamic theory of capabilities and the Three Clocks Theory contribute fundamentally to the paths that managers should follow to rethink executing innovations from top management, seeking to be efficient, effective, and prospective, according to the needs of any organization aimed to social change (García et al., 2014; Santoro et al., 2017; Castro Aniyar, 2022).

Resource-Based Knowledge Management

This theory holds the assumption that an individual's earnings depend on the profitability of the firm, where the organization generates business and operational activity resulting in profitable hiring (Chauvel & Depress, 2002). In this sense, KM converges on the implementation of formal processes that reflect performance through the resource-based theory of knowledge (Beckett et al., 2000; Shin et al., 2001; Lee & Wong, 2015). Resource theory is determined by all that knowledge, both tacit and explicit, internal and external, that is owned by organizations and suggests that resources and capabilities are valuable, difficult to imitate, and non-substitutable, which leads organizations in the long run to success (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; De Gooijer, 2000). Therefore, KM can be presented as a process of acquiring, storing, understanding, sharing, and implementing knowledge that is transmitted with strategies into the organization (Ngah & Wong, 2019). Simultaneously (Lee & Wong, 2015; Shrafat, 2017), express that there are needs based on the capabilities of organizations to facilitate and improve KM activities by analyzing their factors. KM models are promoted through strategies, policies, processes, traditions, and procedures, which are adaptable to organizational sectors due to their complexity (Meier, 2011). Likewise, as part of the dilemmas, Vasconcelos (2008) maintains that in KM it is mentioned within the transfer and conversion of tacit knowledge to explicit knowledge or vice versa. For his part, Darroch (2005) indicates that

KM is a coordinated tool and that organizations can manage their knowledge using resources more efficiently, being better at innovating and developing these projects (Liao & Barnes, 2015). Therefore, it is necessary the implementation of KM projects, involving staff for the implementation of new guidelines, projects, information technology (IT) or innovations (Robbins & O'Gorman, 2016). This is critical, as these resources become useless in the face of staff resistance to using them (Hanisch et al., 2009).

Dynamic Innovation Capacity and the Three Clocks Theory

Teece & Pisano's (1994) theory of dynamic capabilities shows the relationship of resources and capabilities with dynamism in a changing environment, as well as the need for the company to renew to maintain a competitive advantage in organizations and remain in the market. In this sense, Lawson & Samson (2001) argue that the development of the capacity to innovate, from the perspective of dynamic capabilities, builds and promotes innovation based on vision and competitive strategies. In addition, Shang et al. (2009) state that the application of the dynamic capability theory of innovation in service SMEs has a direct relationship with external resources and stimulation, and their own internal knowledge allows the sustainability of innovation. Also, Laforet (2011) states that organizations that are willing to carry out innovative actions should be based on the desire to achieve success as well as on the continuous improvement of working conditions.

This means that those organizations that manage to demonstrate in time-rapid and flexible responses can produce innovation and the ability to manage effectively, thus outperforming, in this way, their local and external competitors, emphasizing two aspects (a) the changing landscape of the sector and (b) the central role in the management of strategies to adapt, integrate, and reconfigure their organizational skills (Teece & Pisano, 1994; Hogan & Coote, 2014). In the meantime, internal and external environmental changes have a direct impact on the resources and competencies of the entire organization. (Teece et al., 1997). In this way, organizations maintain business performance with rapid and immediate innovation, taking advantage of dynamic capabilities to create, implement, and protect intangible assets in the long term (Teece, 2007).

The importance of describing dynamism from this point of view, allows to this argument for more clearly validate the need to understand social reality, given its factorial and chronological complexity. To enter into this complexity, in-field observation would provide meaningful insights to recreate the possibilities of social change efficiently. But to understand descriptions and categories observed by in-field analysts, is not enough. It is necessary to have a frame to look the timing of the social change. Then, prospection theories, developed by anthropology, neurosciences and criminology, have been useful in several contemporary researches looking for prediction and social change. This is the case of the Three Clocks theory.

The Three Clocks Theory

The three clocks theory explains that knowledge implies time, and that time governs the resistance of learning and social change, which is relevant for predicting and social planning (Castro Aniyar, 2023). To understand the time of this resistance, the author shows three temporal dimensions accompanying human learning and its capacities to generate change: the time of things of speech and language (called situational, which is the source of all reality known to humans), the time of formal or informal institutional language (called conjunctural, which, although it appears to be dominant,

constitutes the stabilities created by the social nexus, also of a dynamic basis) and the time of linguistic structures (called structural, which is much more static and dominant, but which functions as a sort of background receptor for the peripheral and centrifugal realities that are generated from speech, and which filter through the conjunctural nexus).

This theory concludes that interactions can be used to learn quickly, but they cannot create profound changes in social norms at different levels. Situational social change is usually superfluous, but necessary because it nests the transmission of the knowledge to the more stables clocks (the conjunctural and the structural). Only something learned in the situation level can boost a general and more stable change if there are vessels receiving this information in the other clocks. This set of transmission and projections is the reason this theory als has been translated as the *three gears*.

True transformative learning emerges from the forces of speech, but it should erode the most static levels of knowledge. Being aware of this implies that the exercise of teaching not only involves introducing information that the learner efficiently repeats, but must also incorporate important temporal variables that must be measured. Therefore, a conducive context results in more complete and realistic learning than learning that is simply reflected in the curriculum in time, perceived only as circumstances of transmission.

The Three Clocks Theory teaches that time defines the nature of knowledge, and therefore, in this context, it is now possible to say that time is a guiding or "governing" principle, and not just a physical circumstance. The theory matches the SET theory, that discovered different times of learning in animal neurosciences (Church & Deluty, 1977: 216-228).

The application of these ideas in management of social change, privileges the importance of situation: in order to reveal the timing of the prospected social change it is necessary get into the situation from inside, which means a new set of strategies, watchtowers, ethnographic and quantitative tools and, overall, to place the resource-based strategies on the situation.

METHOD

The methodology applied was of the documentary exploration type, based mainly on the literature review of first-impact articles. Then, with this vision, a total of 90 scientific articles were considered for review, from which 62 works were exhaustively chosen that define the relationship between the variables of the study, as well as the actions of the organizations now of interaction between the two variables. In this way, following the methodologies detailed in the articles of (Meier, 2011; Cabrera, & Mauricio, 2017; Pino & Ortega, 2018), which consisted of choosing the number of previously selected articles and identifying two criteria, the type of research and the keywords; as a second step, repeated keywords were eliminated from 210 words, and 90 keywords were obtained; finally, from those words that remained, a grouping was made in seven criteria since the keywords that used to converge in the categories of knowledge, technology, innovation, organizational culture, managerial factors, organizational performance, and supply chain management. Then, the dimensions and indicators were determined, considering the type of descriptive methodology with deductive logic, reaffirming the relationship of the articles between the studied variables, improving the understanding and direction of the subject, and allowing the orientation using sequential methodological processes. The specific matrices were made beginning the exploration of the works, following the elaboration

of the literature exploration matrices, and the development of argument by analysis (Machi & McEvory, 2009).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to most of the consulted literature, KM is just presented as the process of acquiring, storing, understanding, sharing, and implementing knowledge. It is not considered the relation between the timing or the sources, although, the most common undertext relates KM as something that occurs inside the organization, as the intrapreneurs work. There is no, in one single paper, an epistemological debate of the importance of the point of depart to produce this expected knowledge.

KM is currently considered one of the ways in which innovation can be fostered through new knowledge, affirming the research of Nonaka & Takeuchi (1995). It is agreed with (Nonaka et al.,2000; Li & Gao, 2003) that in most cases, this new, different, or innovative knowledge always comes from a brilliant entrepreneur who seeks to develop and improve his or her tacit knowledge. In that sense, one way to check if the flow of knowledge or KM is working is that when tacit knowledge arrives in a company's knowledge base, it can be seen that the tacit knowledge is not only new but also innovative to become explicit knowledge, but this must happen first within the organization and then through the chain associated with those involved (Nagh and Wong, 2019; Paoloni et al., 2020). Then, it is a fact that organizations are constantly building their intellectual capital, which means a real challenge to Ganguly et al. (2019). It is contrasted that innovation capability provides a firm with a sustainable competitive advantage in the implementation of a comprehensive strategy. Since understanding how the members of the organization can improve, ensure, or facilitate knowledge sharing effectively helps issues such as innovation, competitiveness, and even sustainability (Muhammed & Zaim, 2020; Apolinario & Guevara, 2021). Meanwhile, it is ratified in the statement of Laperche & Liu (2013), who argue that the ability to innovate is a internal knowledge capital that establishes a set of specific information, which produces more knowledge, and uses it in the creation of processes, both for large and small organizations. According to Ganguly et al. (2019), it is contrasted that innovation capability provides a firm with a sustainable competitive advantage in the implementation of a comprehensive strategy.

According to what was expressed by Zairi (1995), it was compared with respect to the management of new information between departments and collaborators tends to have results through constant and valuable integration, being this the basis of innovation activity, creating methodological structures, small skills, synergistic culture, and teamwork. Therefore, the ECI is present in a direct relationship between knowledge sharing and innovation performance. In this way, Wu (2008) corroborates the approach of management's responsibility in the need to make knowledge productive. For his part, Deschamps (2005) said that managers are the ones called to face the risks now of stimulating innovations and to assume the possible decreases in the organization's competitiveness. Therefore, it is necessary to select the work teams that will be entrusted with the management of the initiatives to execute product or process innovations. Thus, innovation processes involving pre-existing knowledge usually require the generation and acquisition of new knowledge, as well as the establishment of relevant facilities in the processes of learning, knowledge creation, and innovation and improvement of the cycles within these processes, where the responsibilities for the generation of policies, strategies, and tactics are functions of top management and

the organization, must be entirely involved in the process of knowledge creation (Robbins & O'Gorman, 2016; Åslund & Bäckström, 2017; Kearney et al., 2018).

At the same time, Teece (2007), in the proposal of the formal and informal organizational structures and external realizations, should think about the meaning of the innovation or the assignment of competencies, as well as the evolution of this ECI, affirming that they must take this innovation-moderating system according to its degree of application or according to the shortcomings of the work structures. Also, Chauvel & Depress (2002) express that knowledge must evolve according to the changes in its environment by means of adaptability processes based on the needs of new products or processes and creativity in the processes both in individuals and organizations until a point of satisfaction is reached that remains static.

In contrast, Wood (2007) argues that the relationship between KM and ECI starts from strategic processes that must be understood to avoid initial disorders, such as the use of organizational knowledge, promoting continuous adaptability in both goals and processes, resulting from extensive learning from the experiences of evolutionary innovation, leaving the capabilities in the creation of economic and rapid ideas as part of the innovation strategy, allowing to emerge in terrain less explored by rivals (Shrafat, 2017). Thus, the ECI argues that the use of new technologies and information media should be explored as part of continuous improvement, making changes in the work environment (Liao & Barnes 2015). At the same time, which exploits the central core of the organization's processes, requiring skills to identify, acquire, assimilate, and implement the creation of new knowledge into new opportunities; therefore, information technologies and KM are important factors in innovation (Chang et al., 2019; Ganguly et al., 2019). After defining the relationship between the variables KM and CIS, Table 1 shows the elements of interaction between both variables, where the constructs were associated in such a way that the shared elements are identified concretely and objectively in both, differentiated by categories and codes.

CONCLUSIONS

As shown in the traditional management literature, the analyzed papers show a strong connection between innovation and KM, but there is very little on the possibility to explore innovation from the situational point of view, to operate social change or not. This narrative puts all the resources on the staff, and its abilities to obtain valuable information and to relate it. I a certain way, the strategy commonly accepted waits for a smart group of people, having the possibility to think out of the box, to produce innovation, without considering the *locus*, it means, the point of depart in the real situation, its people and its timing.

In that sense, the innovation process feeds back on experience-based learning, and in technical-critical knowledge, but waits that the context comes alone inside the staff culture. In addition, Darroch (2005) suggests that what we call intangible assets is related to the components of tacit knowledge within the organization, and among those components is precisely the experience and intellectual capital of the organization's members. But it does not explain that what is called "tacit" is the result of smart people, of course, but also of the deep observational learnings in situations other than the organization inner context.

Also, in conducting a thorough and exhaustive literature review using the triangulation method, it was found that the variables KM and ECI are related. That is, according to the used

methodology, the construction strategies classified in the KM variable have common indicators such as knowledge interaction. This is supported by what Daniel & Huang (2019) state about the intuitive in thinking, that the greater proportion of tacit knowledge you have, the greater the explicit knowledge generated in a business project. However, in reality, interaction and intuition mainly come from observation, which uses to be extremely richer in the lived situation of really interacting people inside real fields for a long exposure time. This means that the knowledge that is acquired at work through interactions, synergistic compressions, and the exchange of experience in different activities resides in the mind of everyone, but it is only considered as given fact, before the hiring.

This relationship is accentuated in understanding, where the conception of the capacity presented by the individual or groups of individuals in learning and retaining information is known as absorption capacity, which after operationalizing there is an added value effect in the human interpretative contribution in the resources and capabilities of the organization. In this way, it is found that the acquired skills and competencies just are recognized from contexts, such as customers, suppliers, competitors, collaborators, and others, and "magically" incorporated it into the intrinsic bases of the organization's own knowledge.

Theories briefly described or referenced here, like SET, the Three Clocks, Dynamic Innovation Capacity and, even, meaningful management experiences, such as social economical entrepreneurships, warn about the dangers to think in the social change just from inside the organization, and about importance to think on the timing of things before acting. Goals so important and complexes as the SDG, must be understood inside its situational reality: timing, culture and specific variables, in order to prospect social responsibility.

It the practice of management of social responsibility, everybody knows about the distance between the isolated dream of changing the world, and the reality of its application. To reduce this distance it is mandatory to understand complexity from situation and its dynamics, which is contained in the ***locus*** of control of knowledge

REFERENCES

Abouzeedan, A., Klofsten, M., & Hedner, T. (2013). Internalization management as a facilitator for managing innovation in high-technology smaller - firms. *Global Business Review*, *14(1)*, 121-136. doi:10.1177/0972150912466462.

Apolinario, R., & Guevara, D. (2021). Efecto mediador de la capacidad ejecutiva para la innovación entre la gestión del conocimiento y el rendimiento en la cadena de suministro. *Information Technological*, *32(1)*, 1-16.

Åslund, A., & Bäckström, I. (2017). Management processes and management's role in customer value creation. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, *19(4)*, 711 - 734. doi:10.1108/IJQSS-11-2015-0074.

Beckett, A., Wainwright, C., & Bance, D. (2000). Knowledge management: strategy or software?

Management Decision Journal, *38(9)*, 601 - 606. doi: 10.1108/00251740010357221.

Beijerse, R. (2000). Knowledge management in small and medium-sized companies: knowledge management for entrepreneurs. *Journal Knowledge Management*, *4(2)*, 162-179.

Bornstein, David y Davis, Susan (2010). ***Social Entrepreneurship. What Everyone Needs to Know.*** Oxford University Press. NY.

Cabrera, E., & Mauricio, d. (2017). Factors affecting the success of women´s entrepreneurship: a review of

literature. *International Journal of gender and Entrepreneurship*, *9(1)*, 1-47. doi: 10.1108/IJGE-01-2016-0001.

Chang, Y., Wong, S. F., Eze, U., & Lee, H. (2019). The Effect of IT Ambidexterity and Cloud Computing Absorptive Capacity on Competitive Advantage. Industrial Management and Data Systems, *119(3)*, 613–638. doi:10.1108/IMDS-05-2018-0196.

Castro Aniyar, D. (2022). El arte de la predicción social. Apuntes sobre el uso de la ciencia y las emociones en sistemas inteligentes de predicción, en Cruz Marte, I. y Espinoza, A. (2022). *El Futuro del Delito. Prognosis y Propuestas para el Campo Jurídico y Criminológico en el Siglo XXI.* Editorial Mawil. https://mawil.us/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/EL-FUTURO-DEL-DELITO.pdf

Chauvel, D., & Depress, C. (2002). A review of survey research in knowledge management: 1997- 2001. Journal of Knowledge Management, *6(3)*, 207 - 223. doi:10.1108/13673270210434322.

Daniel, L., & Huang, F. (2019). Dynamic capabilities and the knowledge nexus: Leveraging ICT, absorptive capacity, and human potential. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, *49(4)*, 477-493. doi:10.1108/VJIKMS-01-2019-0003.

Darroch, J. (2005). Knowledge management, innovation, and firm performance. *Journal Knowledge Management*, *9(3)*, 101-115. doi:10-1108/13673270510602809.

Dayan, R., Heisig, P., & Matos, F. (2017). Knowledge management as a factor for the formulation and implementation of organization strategy. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *21(2*), 1- 47. doi:10.1108/JKM-02-2016-0068.

Dees, Gregory; Emerson, Jed; Economy, Peter (2002). "Strategic Tools of Social Entrepreneurs. Enhancing the Performance of your Enterprising Non-Profit". John Wiley and Sons, Inc. S/c.

De Gooijer, J. d. (2000). Designing a knowledge management performance framework. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *4(4)*, 303-310.

Deschamps, J. (2005). Different leadership skills for different innovation strategies. *Strategy and Leadership*, 31-38. doi:10.1108/10878570510616861.

Diaz, M., Bornay, M., & Lopez, A. (2015). Innovation and firm performance: The role of HRM practices. *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 10.1108/EBHRM-10-2012-0012.

Evans, N., Ralston, B., & Broderick, A. (2009). Strategic thinking about disruptive technologies. *Strategy & Leadership*, *37(1)*, 23 - 30. doi:10.1108/10878570910926034.

Fairbanks, Michael y Lindsay, Stace (1997). Plowing the Sea. Nurturing the Hidden Sources of Growth in the Developing World. Harvard Business School Press. Bostom.

Ferreira, J., Mueller, J., & Papa, A. (2018). Strategic knowledge management: theory, practice and future challenges. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *24(2)*, 5-10. doi:10.1108/JKM-07- 2018-461.

Ganguly, A., Talukdaran, A., & Debdeep, C. (2019). Evaluating the role of social capital, tacit knowledge sharing, knowledge quality and reciprocity in determining innovation capability of an organization. *Journal Knowledge Management*, *23(6)*, 1105-1135. doi:10.1108/JKM-03- 2018-0190.

García, O., Quintero, J., & Arias, J. (2014). Capacidades de innovación, desempeño innovador y desempeño organizacional en empresas de sector de servicios. *Cuadernos de Administración*, *27(49)*, 87-108.

Hanisch, B., Lindner, F., Mueller, a., & Wald, A. (2009). Knowledge management in project environments. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *13(4)*, 148-160. doi:10.1108/13673270910971897.

Harrison, T., & Bazzy, J. (2017). Alig-

ning organizational culture and strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management Development*, *36(10)*, 1260-1269. doi:10.1108/JMD-12-2016-0335.

Hogan, S., & Coote, L. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 1, 1-13. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.09.007.

Kaur, J., Kumar, S., & Goyal, M. (2019). Improving organizational performance through competitive advantage: an empirical analysis with reference to Indian IT industry. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business*, 20(4), 342-361. doi:10.1080/10599231.2019.1684169.

Kearney, A., Harrington, D., & Kelliher, F. (2018). Executive capability for innovation the Irish seaport sector. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *42(5/6)*, 342-361. doi:10.1108/EJTD-10-2017-0081

Laforet, S. (2011). A framework of organisational innovation and outcomes in SMEs.

International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, *17(4)*, 380 - 408. doi:10.1108/13552551111139638.

Laperche, B., & Liu, Z. (2013). SMEs and knowledge-capital formation ininnovation networks: a review of literature. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, *2(21)*, 1-16.

Lawson, B., & Samson, D. (2001). Developing innovation capabiliting oraganizations: a dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management 5(3)*, 377-400.

Lee, C., & Wong, K. (2015). Development and validation of knowledge management performance measurement constructs for small and medium enterprises. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 19(4)*, 711 - 734. doi:10.1108/JKM-10-2014-0398.

Li, M., & Gao, F. (2003). Why Nonaka highlights tacit knowledge: a critical review. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 7(4)*, 6-14. doi: 10.1108/13673270310492903.

Liao, Y., & Barnes, J. (2015). Knowledge acquisition and product innovation flexibility in SMEs. *Business Process Management Journal*, *21(6)*, 1-46. doi:10.1108/BPMJ-05- 2014- 0039.

Machi, L., & McEvory, B. (2009). *The literature review: six steps to success*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Maestrini, V., Luzzini, D., Caniato, F., Maccarrone, P., & Ronchi, S. (2018). The impact of supplier performance measurement systems on supplier performance: A dyadic lifecycle perspective. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 1, 1-23. doi:10.1108/IJOPM-10-2016-0589.

Meier, M. (2011). Knowledge management in strategic alliances: a review of empirical evidence.

British Academic of Management, 13, 1-23- doi:10-1111/j.1468-2370-2010.00287. x.

Muhammed, S., & Zaim, H. (2020). Peer knowledge sharing and organizational performance: the role of leadership support and knowledge management success. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. 1, 1-35. doi:10.1108/JKM-03-2020-0227.

Ngah, R., & Wong, K. (2020). Linking knowledge management to competitive strategies of knowledge-based SMEs. *The Bottom Line, 33(1)*, 42-59. doi:10.1108/BL-08-2019-0105.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, N. (1995). *The knowledge - creating company: how Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nonaka, I., Toyoma, R., & Cono, n. (2000). SECI, Be a leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge. *Long Rangers Planning*, 5-34.

Paoloni, M., Coluccia, D., Fontana, S., & Silvia, S. (2020). Knowledge management, intellectual capital and entrepre-

neurship: a structured literature review. *Journal Knowledge Management*, 1, 1-22. doi:10.1108/JKM-01-2020-0052.

Pereira, V., Mellahi, K., Temouri, Y., Patnaik, S., & Roohanifar, M. (2018). Investigating dynamic capabilities, agility and knowledge management within EMNEs- longitudinal evidence from Europe. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 1, 1-22. doi:10.1108/JKM- 06-2018-0391.

Pino, R., & Ortega, A. (2018). Regional innovation systems: systematic literature review and recommendations for future research. *Gogent Business Management*, 5, 1-17. doi:10.1080/23311975.2018.1463606.

Robbins, P., & O'Gorman, C. (2016). Innovation Processes: Do They Help or Hinder New Product Development Outcomes in Irish SMEs? *Irish Journal of Management*, *35(1)*, 88-103. doi:10.1515/ijm-2016-0006.

Santoro, G., Vrontis, D., Thrassou, A., & Dezi, L. (2017). The Internet of Things: Building a knowledge management system for open innovation and knowledge management capacity. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 1, 1-8. doi:10.1016/j.techfore.2017.02.034.

Seo, Y., Dinwoodie, J., & Kwak, D. (2014). The impact of innovativeness on supply chain performance: is supply chain integration a missing link? *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 19(5/6)*, 733-746. doi:10.1108/SCM-02-2014-0058.

Shang, S., Lin, S.-F., & Wu, Y.-L. (2009). Service innovation through dynamic knowledge management. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 109(3)*, 322 - 337. doi:10.1108/02635570910939362.

Shin, M., Holden, T., & Schmidt, r. (2001). From Knowledge theory to management practice: towards and integrated approach. *Information Processing & Management*, 37, 335-355.

Shrafat, F. (2017). Examining the factors influencing knowledge management system (KMS) adoption in small and medium enterprises SMEs. *Business Process Management Journal*, 1, 1-43. doi:10.1108/BPMJ-10-2016-0221.

Sundram, V., Chandran, V., & Bhatti, M. (2016). Supply chain practices and performance: the indirect effects of supply chain integration. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 23(6), 1445-1471. doi: 10.1108/BIJ-03-2015-0023.

Tecee, D. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and micro foundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Journal of Strategic management, 28(13)*, 1319- 1350. doi:10.1002smj-640.

Teece, D., & Pisano, G. (1994). The dynamic capabilities of firms: an introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 3(3)*, 537-556. doi:10.1093/icc/3.3.537-a.

Teece, D., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management.

Strategic Management, 18(7), 509-533.

Vasconcelos, A. (2008). Dilemmas in knowledge management. *Library Management, 29(4/5)*, 422- 433. doi:10.1108/01435120810869165.

Wood, R. (2007). How strategic innovation really gets started. *Strategy & Leadership, 35(1)*, 2129. doi:10.1108/10878570710717254.

Wu, C. (2008). Knowledge creation in a supply chain. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 13(3)*, 241-250. doi:10.1108/13598540810871280.

Yunnus, Muhammad (2007). "Creating a World Without Poverty. Social Business and the Future of Capitalism". Public Affairs. NY.

Zairi, M. (1995). Moving from continuous to discontinuous innovation in FMCG: are- engineering perspective. *World Class Design to Manufacture*, 32-35. doi:10.1108/09642369310095201.