1st Global Peter Drucker Forum

Vienna, Austria

19-20, November 2009

The Topic:

Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Productivity: The Taiwan Biotech Industry

The Authors Yi-Chun Huang, Associate Professor, **Dept. of Business Administration National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences** peterhun@cc.kuas.edu.tw Yen-Chun Jim Wu, Professor, **Dept. of Business Management Director, International Business MBA Program, College of Management National Sun Yat-Sen University**

Present Content

Introduction
 Literature Review
 Research Methods
 Conclusion

AThe world is fast moving from a production-based economy to a knowledgebased one (Drucker, 1993; **Powell and Snellman,** 2004).

Drucker (1999b) states that the most important contribution management needs to make in the **21st century is similarly to increase** the productivity of knowledge work and the knowledge worker.

A Therefore, the ability of firms to generate and exploit new forms of knowledge is vitally important (Anand *et al.*, 2007).

1. Introduction The economic challenge of the post-capitalist society will therefore be the productivity of knowledge work and the knowledge worker (Drucker, 1993).

Knowledge productivity is a tricky construct.

1. Introduction Some scholars adopt a macroeconomic perspective to interpret knowledge productivity as a result (Machlup, 1972), **while others apply a managerial** perspective to interpret knowledge productivity as a human ability (Drucker, 1981; Drucker, 1993; Drucker, 1999b).

1. Introduction A This study integrates both perspectives to define knowledge productivity as the capability with which individuals, teams, and units across an organization achieve knowledge-based improvements, exploitation, and innovations.

Q Drucker (1999b) argued that knowledge-worker productivity will be the biggest managerial challenge of the 21st- century, and in developed countries, a first requirement for mere survival (p. 157).

& Knowledge productivity did not receive much attention until knowledge researchers began to explore a theory of knowledge productivity. **Q** Furthermore, in the existing academic literature, little is known as to how new knowledge is created, and empirical work is particularly lacking.

Q Drucker (1993) argued that making knowledge productive is the responsibility of management and requires a systematic and organized application of knowledge to knowledge (p. 190). **1. Introduction Q** It is known that organizations adopt different approaches for accumulating and utilizing their knowledge, and that these approaches present themselves as different aspects of intellectual capital, i.e., human, organizational, and social capital.

4 It is also widely accepted that an organization's capability to innovate is closely tied to its intellectual capital (Tsai and Ghoshal, 1998; Subramaniam and Venkatraman, 2001; Subramaniam and Youndt, 2005).

Previous studies have revealed that intellectual capital is positively and significantly related to organizational performance. Recently, there has been increasing research focused on the relationships among intellectual capital, innovation, and competitiveness.

On the other hand, the interaction between innovation and knowledge management or intellectual capital has also been studied.

Q In this context, the dimensions of intellectual capital are interactive, transformable, and complementary activities, meaning that a resource's productivity may be improved through investments in other resources.

1. Introduction Numerous researchers have studied the relationships among intellectual capital, innovation, and competitiveness, but few studies have explored the relationship between intellectual capital and knowledge productivity, which is the primary aim of this study.

The objectives of this study are: (1) to examine the relationship between intellectual capital components and knowledge productivity

(2) to study interactive effects between intellectual capital components and knowledge productivity.

Knowledge Productivity

There are two different interpretive perspectives:

(1) Machlup's Perspective(2) Drucker's Perspective

Machlup's (1972) perspective, 0 based on economic theory, interpreted knowledge productivity as a result, aimed at explaining. **These conclusions drew attention** to the relationships between knowledge, value creation, and

economic growth.

0

Drucker's perspective, based on managerial theories, interpreted knowledge productivity as an organizational ability and aimed at improving the knowledge-based production process.

Subsequently, Harrison and Kessels 2 (2004) proposed that "knowledge productivity concerns the way in which individuals, teams and units across an organization achieve **knowledge-based improvements** and innovations".

 Stam (2007) argued that
 "knowledge productivity refers to the process of transforming knowledge into value".

This study defines knowledge productivity as the capability with which individuals, teams, and units across an organization achieve knowledge-based improvements, exploitation, and innovations.

2. Literature Review Key Knowledge Productivity Factors: Drucker (1999a) highlighted six major 9 factors which determine knowledgeworker productivity. These were task, autonomy, continuous innovation, continuous learning and teaching, quality, and treating the knowledge worker as an asset rather than a cost (p. 142).

2. Literature Review Key Knowledge Productivity Factors: Harrison and Kessels (2004) argued for the "Corporate Curriculum", which involves "transforming the daily workplace into an environment where learning and working can be effectively integrated.

2

Key Knowledge Productivity Factors: Stam (2007) proposed the knowledge productivity (KP) enhancer, that includes acquiring subject matter expertise, learning to identify and solve problems, cultivating reflective skills, securing communication skills, acquiring skills for self regulation of motivation, promoting peace and stability, and causing creative turmoil in order to stimulate innovation.

- Key Knowledge Productivity Factors:
 Based on the above literature, scholars have mainly suggested human resource and organizational structure approaches.
 We know that above all, making
 - knowledge productive is a managerial responsibility. It requires a systematic and organized application of knowledge to knowledge (Drucker, 1993).

Key Knowledge Productivity Factors: It is known that organizations adopt 2 different approaches for accumulating and utilizing their knowledge, and that these approaches present themselves as different aspects of intellectual capital, i.e., human, organizational, and social capital (Davenport and Prusak, 1998; Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998).

Key Knowledge Productivity Factors: The concept of intellectual capital is based on the belief that the main resources for building competitive advantage are intangible in nature (Edvinsson and Malone, 1997; Stewart, 1997; Sveiby, 1997).

 Key Knowledge Productivity Factors:
 Therefore, this research introduces a theory of intellectual capital, and explores its influence on knowledge productivity.

Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Productivity

2. Literature Review Hypothesis 1: The greater the human capital in organizations, the higher the knowledge productivity. **Aypothesis 2:** The greater the organizational capital in organizations, the higher the knowledge productivity.

Hypothesis 3:

The greater the social capital in organizations, the higher the knowledge productivity.

2. Literature Review Moderating Effect of Social Capital Hypothesis 4: The greater social capital in organizations, the stronger the influence of human capital on knowledge productivity.

2. Literature Review Moderating Effect of Social Capital Hypothesis 5: The greater social capital in organizations, the stronger the influence of organizational capital on knowledge productivity.

3. Research Methods

3.1 Research Framework

Interactive Effects Human Capital x Social Capital Structural Capital x Social Capital

Intellectual Capital Human Capital Structural Capital Social Capital

Knowledge Productivity

Fig. 1 Conceptual Structure for this Research

Intellectual capital and knowledge productivity both reside at the organizational level and require "strategic awareness" from informants to respond to questionnaires such as that used in this study.

Drucker (1993) emphasized that "a manager is one who is responsible for the application and performance of knowledge" (p. 44). **A Drucker (1993) argued that the** function of organizations is to make

knowledge productive (p. 49).

Based on this organizational focus, this study selected managers of R&D departments as respondents.

3. Data Collection The questionnaires were mailed to **(1)**members of the Taiwan **Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association (TPMA) and the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Chinese Medicine** (PMACM) and **(2)**biotechnology firms listed in a 2005 survey conducted by the Taiwan

Institute of Economic Research.

A total of 110 questionnaires were mailed to pharmaceutical companies, 220 to Chinese medicine pharmaceuticals, and 380 to biotechnology companies.

A total of 113 valid responses were obtained after 6 weeks, representing a valid response rate of 15.92%. An analysis of respondents and non-respondents revealed no differences in industry membership, number of employees, or revenues.

4. Conclusion

		a la companya da la c	Charles Charles			Contraction in the local division of the loc	
Dependent. Variable	Knowledge Productivity						
Independent Variable	Model 1				Model 2		
	Beta	t	р.	VIF	Beta	t	p.
Taiwan Biotechnology Industry	0.330	3.658	0.000		0.303	3.428	0.001
Taiwan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers	0.243	2.998	0.003		0.226	2.813	0.006
Age	-0.005	-0.066	0.948		-0.029	-0.401	0.689
Size	0.006	0.079	0.937		0.000	-0.005	0.996
Human Capital	0.281	3.670	0.000	1.242	0.274	3.693	0.000
Organizational Capital	0.208	2.851	0.005	1.072	0.206	2.920	0.004
Social Capital	0.296	3.861	0.000	1.259	0.252	3.319	0.001
Human Capital x Social Capital					0.173	2.647	0.009
Organizational Capital x Social Capital					-0.098	-1.487	0.140
F	18.729				16.492		
Sig.	0.000				0.000		
R _a ²	0.526				0.555		
$\triangle R_a^2$					0.029		
Sig. F Change						0.000	

Table 3 Regression Analysis for Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Productivity (n=113)

The purpose of this study was to theoretically and empirically examine the link between intellectual capital and knowledge productivity. This study provided evidence that all dimensions of intellectual capital positively and significantly influenced knowledge productivity.

Additionally, this research found that social and human capital interaction was significantly and positively related to knowledge productivity. However, the study found that the social and organizational capital interaction was negatively but insignificantly related to knowledge productivity.

Implication

The social and organizational capital interaction was significantly negatively related to knowledge productivity. **A possible explanation for the** lack of interaction is that, in some cases, organizational capital may actually hinder knowledge productivity.

Highly formalized processes, systems, structures, etc. have a tendency to reinforce existing norms and obviate against the variation and change that promote knowledge productivity. Therefore, this study suggests that managers build contingent circumstances for dynamic knowledge productivity.

