



UNICA

UNIVERSITÀ  
DEGLI STUDI  
DI CAGLIARI



Università di Cagliari

## UNICA IRIS Institutional Research Information System

**This is the Author's [accepted] manuscript version of the following contribution:**

Morea Donato, Iazzolino Gianpaolo, Petruzelli Messeni Antonio, Omeihe Kingsley Obi, "Guest editorial: What if intellectual capital is the missing link in sustainable development?", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, volume 27, fascicolo 1, 2026, pp. 1-7.

**The publisher's version is available at:**

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/jic-01-2026-416>

*© Emerald Publishing Limited. This AAM is provided for your own personal use only. It may not be used for resale, reprinting, systematic distribution, emailing, or for any other commercial purpose without the permission of the publisher.*

**When citing, please refer to the published version.**

## EDITORIAL ESSAY

### *What If Intellectual Capital Is the Missing Link in Sustainable Development?*

It is our great pleasure to introduce this editorial for the special issue on Intellectual Capital and the Sustainable Development Goals. Despite the global momentum around the SDGs, the full potential of intellectual capital has yet to be realised. As Editors, we asked ourselves a simple but important question: *what if intellectual capital is the missing link in sustainable development?* This question reflects the purpose of the special issue. Our aim has been to take a broad, multidisciplinary view of how intellectual capital connects with the Sustainable Development Goals. And to offer insights into the organisational and individual processes that support this connection. To direct more research to this area, we aimed to identify the common ground within intellectual capital research, while recognising that scholars bring different perspectives that each contribute meaningfully to the field.

Although many strands of work on intellectual capital have emerged, we acknowledge that the field itself has developed significantly. From its early beginnings, where scholars explored what made intellectual capital relevant to organisational performance, the field has expanded to embrace a wider set of perspectives that reflect the multiple dimensions of the field (see Mouritsen *et al.*, 2002; Inkinen, 2015; Duodu and Rowlinson, 2019; Scuotto *et al.*, 2019). These developments have brought important insights into the role of human and relational assets in shaping organisational behaviour and long-term value creation (Petty and Guthrie, 2000; Edvinsson, 2002; Edvinsson, 2013). Yet across these perspectives, the story also suggests that intellectual capital alone is not enough. This body of work indicates that for IC to respond effectively to global development challenges, more is required. In essence, this means bringing greater integration and paying closer attention to how organisational systems interact with the people who drive them. This recognition shapes our special issue and provides the motivation for the contributions included here.

It may appear that we believe the SDGs represent an ambitious and interconnected agenda for the future, and in many ways they do. Work to date has shown that addressing them requires the ability to innovate and adapt to changing social, economic and environmental conditions. However, as the contributions in this special issue demonstrate, these abilities are deeply rooted in the intangible assets that make up intellectual capital. Human capital includes skills, knowledge, experience, creativity and values. It helps people make sense of complexity and imagine new solutions. Structural capital refers to the systems, cultures, routines and technologies that support sustainable practices. Relational capital focuses on partnerships, networks and trust. It helps organisations work together across different sectors. Taken together, these forms of intellectual capital create the conditions needed for organisations and societies to pursue the SDGs with purpose and coherence. This special issue aims to promote a more integrated understanding of these relationships rather than a fragmented view of their development.

At the organisational level, it is increasingly recognised that firms face growing pressures to embed environmental, social and governance principles within their reporting frameworks. These expectations sit alongside wider demands to build organisational resilience in response

1  
2  
3 to technological disruption and shifting societal norms (see Crammond *et al.*, 2018; Scuotto *et*  
4 al., 2025). Such challenges cannot be met through financial capital alone. They depend  
5 fundamentally on the depth and quality of intellectual capital. This reliance is evident at the  
6 individual level as well. Leadership cognition, employee skills, experience, creativity and  
7 values shape how people interpret change, respond to uncertainty and contribute to sustainable  
8 practice. These individual capabilities interact with organisational culture, systems and  
9 relational networks, creating the conditions through which learning, adaptation and innovation  
10 can take place.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 It is important to recognise that leadership cognition, workforce capabilities, organisational  
16 culture and relational infrastructures do not represent a single underlying construct (see Matos  
17 and Edvinsson, 2020; Ordonez and Edvinsson, 2020; Mercier-Laurent and Edvinsson, 2021).  
18 Each plays a distinct role in shaping both individual behaviour and organisational performance.  
19 There is strong evidence that, together, these elements support the learning and sense making  
20 capacities required for sustained strategic renewal. It is no exception that the contributions to  
21 this special issue reinforce a central point: intellectual capital across individual, organisational  
22 and relational domains is a key driver of long term sustainable transformation.

23  
24  
25  
26 A central feature of this special issue is the attention given to the two levels of intellectual  
27 capital, organisational and individual, and the recognition that sustainable development  
28 requires contributions from both. Organisational intellectual capital captures the collective  
29 capabilities that shape how institutions operate and respond to complex demands. We also  
30 suggest that existing scholarship in this area has become somewhat narrow and would benefit  
31 from broader theoretical development. Individual intellectual capital, in contrast, resides in  
32 people and is expressed through their expertise, values and creative capacities. Across this  
33 special issue, we aim to demonstrate that although each level has its own significance, it is the  
34 interaction between them that offers the greatest potential for advancing sustainable  
35 development. Organisational systems can either support or limit the ability of individuals to  
36 contribute meaningfully to the SDGs, while individuals can either reinforce or weaken the  
37 cultural and behavioural foundations needed for long term sustainability.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42 To advance this line of inquiry, we have framed the call for this special issue around the  
43 interplay between organisational and individual intellectual capital and the implications of this  
44 relationship for sustainable development.

45  
46  
47 Each of the six articles in this special issue extends current thinking about intellectual capital  
48 in new directions and contributes to the conversation we seek to open about individual and  
49 organisational pathways for addressing sustainability. In the paper, '*the effect of executive green*  
50 *human capital on green mergers and acquisition*', Shi, Xu and Ding (2025), take important  
51 initial steps toward understanding how executive green human capital shapes firms'  
52 engagement in green mergers and acquisitions. The authors recognise that the environmental  
53 orientation of senior leaders is central to driving credible corporate environmental action,  
54 particularly in emerging economies. They skilfully integrate Python based textual analysis with  
55 established perspectives on pro environmental behaviour to capture the green capabilities of  
56 executives and link these to strategic outcomes.

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Consistent with the mechanisms proposed in the literature, the authors show that executives  
4 with stronger green expertise and awareness are more likely to steer their firms towards genuine  
5 green mergers and acquisitions. For example, they demonstrate that such executives display  
6 higher environmental responsibility and less managerial short-term thinking, which strengthens  
7 firms' commitment to substantive environmental initiatives. The dynamics they uncover point  
8 to meaningful rather than symbolic environmental action, offering valuable insight into the  
9 internal drivers of green strategic behaviour.  
10  
11  
12

13 At the same time, the ideas developed by Colamartino, Toma and Schiuma (2025) in  
14 '*Leveraging intellectual capital for sustainable innovation: a spatial analysis of resilience in*  
15 *the olive oil sector*' take important initial steps toward understanding how intellectual capital  
16 can support sustainable innovation in the agri-food sector. The authors recognise that rural  
17 industries, and the olive oil sector in particular, are increasingly exposed to climate instability  
18 and competitive pressures. Taken together, these observations point to the value of combining  
19 spatial analysis with intellectual capital perspectives to explore how proximity and consortium  
20 membership shape firms' resilience and innovative capacity.  
21  
22  
23

24 Their nine year analysis of 1,827 Italian olive oil firms reveals clear spatial patterns in the role  
25 of Geographical Indication consortia. For example, firms that belong to these consortia and are  
26 located close to one another are better placed to share climatic risks and sustain innovation  
27 activity during environmental shocks. The dynamics they identify show how the human,  
28 structural and relational dimensions of intellectual capital work together to support economic  
29 and environmental resilience.  
30  
31  
32

33 In '*Unveiling the masking effect: the role of R and D human capital in collaborative innovation*  
34 *and sustainability*', Lei, Chen, Wang and Zhou (2025) construct an intriguing analysis in order  
35 to address how R and D human capital shapes the relationship between collaborative innovation  
36 and sustainable innovation. The authors set out to identify the causal connections between these  
37 elements, recognising that much existing work assumes a simple positive link while offering  
38 limited evidence on the underlying mechanisms. To address this gap, they draw on data from  
39 Chinese A share listed firms from 2009 to 2022 and establish a clear causal pathway from  
40 collaborative innovation to sustainable innovation. Their analysis reveals a masking effect in  
41 which R and D human capital plays an enabling role but also slightly reduces the overall  
42 strength of the collaborative effect. While the ideas that collaboration automatically enhances  
43 sustainability play an influential part in the existing literature, the authors show that this  
44 relationship is more complex. For example, the effect is stronger in collaborations between  
45 firms than in industry university partnerships, and more evident among firms with lower R and  
46 D intensity. Their work lays a solid foundation for future research.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 Given the evidence emerging across this special issue, we believe that careful attention to the  
54 interaction between individual and organisational intellectual capital opens new questions  
55 about how firms build sustainability capabilities. With these ideas come questions about how  
56 intellectual capital shapes not only internal processes but also the wider performance outcomes  
57 associated with environmental, social and governance dimensions. We believe that inquiry of  
58 this kind is advanced by the contribution offered by Amitrano, Hani, Troise and Cappa (2025)  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in *‘Individual and organizational intellectual capital, ESG dimensions and competitive*  
4 *advantage: a focus on Italian SME’*. In this paper, the authors examine how intellectual capital  
5 at both the individual and organisational levels influence firms’ environmental, social and  
6 governance outcomes, and how these, in turn, shape competitive advantage. Drawing on survey  
7 data from small and medium sized enterprises in Italy, they develop a multilevel framework  
8 that positions human and relational capital at the individual level and structural and  
9 organisational capital at the organisational level. They apply this framework through structural  
10 equation modelling with a newly validated perceived ESG scale. The authors show that  
11 structural capital contributes positively across all three ESG dimensions, and that  
12 organisational capital strongly drives environmental performance but may constrain social  
13 sustainability in the short term. These insights may be valuable, for example, in investigating  
14 how smaller enterprises manage the tension between short term financial constraints and  
15 longer-term sustainability goals.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 In *‘The nexus of green intellectual capital and sustainable performance: leadership*  
22 *commitment and knowledge sharing as influences’*, Elnagar and Aljuwaiber (2025) build on  
23 the notion that green intellectual capital plays an important role in shaping sustainability  
24 outcomes in service organisations. The authors recognise that the hospitality sector in Saudi  
25 Arabia poses a wide range of environmental and operational challenges, and they leverage  
26 dynamic capabilities theory to investigate how leadership commitment and knowledge sharing  
27 influence the relationship between green intellectual capital and sustainable performance. In  
28 our view, their paper offers some pertinent insights into how intellectual capital dynamics  
29 operate in service settings. In particular, the work highlights the multiple ways in which  
30 leadership commitment and knowledge sharing shape sustainability outcomes, and this poses  
31 important questions for future research on capability development in the hospitality sector.  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Coupled with the above work, the ideas developed by Ahmad, Wu and Sualeh Khattak in  
37 *‘Linking green intellectual capital to sustainability and sustainable business model innovation*  
38 *in manufacturing SMEs’* suggest that green intellectual capital plays a central role in shaping  
39 the sustainability performance of firms operating in emerging economies. Their study examines  
40 manufacturing firms in Pakistan and shows how green intellectual capital contributes to  
41 economic, social and environmental performance. Further, the paper reminds intellectual  
42 capital researchers that there is a need to continue to move beyond narrow conceptions of  
43 capability and to examine how different dimensions of green intellectual capital shape multiple  
44 aspects of sustainability performance. We certainly agree with this, and the call for this special  
45 issue emphasises the importance of such work. Their insightful emphasis prompts us to  
46 consider the need for greater attention to the dynamic interaction between innovation processes  
47 and capability development, especially in small and medium sized enterprises in emerging  
48 contexts.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

## 54 **Conclusion**

55 The contributions in this special issue deepen our understanding of how intellectual capital  
56 informs organisational responses to sustainability challenges. Collectively, these papers  
57 illustrate that intellectual capital is not a static stock of assets but a dynamic set of capabilities  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 that shape how organisations interpret their environment and pursue the Sustainable  
4 Development Goals. In our view, a key insight emerging from this body of work is the  
5 importance of multilevel interactions. Intellectual capital operates simultaneously at the  
6 individual, organisational and network levels, and the interplay between these levels appears  
7 central to explaining how firms develop and sustain environmentally and socially responsible  
8 practices. This emphasis aligns with broader developments within management research,  
9 where questions of capability formation, organisational learning and strategic renewal continue  
10 to attract sustained attention.  
11  
12  
13

14 The articles also point to the value of more integrated theoretical approaches. Across the special  
15 issue, dynamic capabilities, resource-based reasoning, knowledge-based perspectives and  
16 sustainability scholarship intersect in ways that highlight the potential for intellectual capital  
17 research to contribute more directly to debates on responsible management and long term value  
18 creation. For JIC readers, this is especially relevant, as it underscores the managerial,  
19 organisational and societal implications of intellectual capital in contemporary business  
20 environments.  
21  
22  
23

24 Looking ahead, we see significant scope for further theoretical elaboration and empirical  
25 extension. Opportunities exist to explore how intellectual capital evolves over time, how it  
26 interacts with digital transformation and regulatory change, and how it shapes organisational  
27 resilience under conditions of uncertainty. Addressing these opportunities and challenges will  
28 require more comparative work across sectors, institutional contexts and cultural settings to  
29 enrich our understanding of the contingencies that influence intellectual capital's role in  
30 sustainability. We hope this special issue encourages researchers to take forward these lines of  
31 inquiry. Our hope is that future research will continue to examine the contribution of  
32 intellectual capital to the Sustainable Development Goals with analytical depth and  
33 methodological rigour. We thank all authors and reviewers for their thoughtful engagement,  
34 and we look forward to the next phase of research that this work will undoubtedly inspire.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

Ahmad M, Wu Q, Sualeh Khattak M (2025;), "Linking green intellectual capital to sustainability and sustainable business model innovation in manufacturing SMEs: the role of green dynamic capability". *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-10-2024-0314>

Amitrano CC, Hani Gheith M, Troise C, Cappa F (2025;), "Individual and organizational intellectual capital, ESG dimensions and competitive advantage: a focus on Italian SMEs". *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-12-2024-0411>

Colamartino C, Toma P, Schiuma G (2025). 'Leveraging intellectual capital for sustainable innovation: a spatial analysis of resilience in the olive oil sector'. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-10-2024-0328>

Crammond R, Omeihe KO, Murray A, and Ledger K (2018). "Managing knowledge through social media: Modelling an entrepreneurial approach for Scottish SMEs and beyond". *Baltic Journal of Management*, Vol. 13 No. 3 pp. 303–328, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-05-2017-0133>

Duodu, B. and Rowlinson, S. (2019), "Intellectual capital for exploratory and exploitative innovation: exploring linear and quadratic effects in construction contractor firms", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 382-405.

Edvinsson, L. (2002). "Corporate longitude - navigating the knowledge economy found at", available at: <https://www.pearson.com/Edvinsson-Corporate-Longitude-What-you-need-to-know-tonavigate-the-knowledge-economy/PGM26927.html>.

Edvinsson, L. (2013). "IC 21: reflections from 21 years of IC practice and theory", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 163-172.

Elnagar AK, Aljuwaiber A (2025). 'The nexus of green intellectual capital and sustainable performance: leadership commitment and knowledge sharing as influences'. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-09-2024-0290>

Lei H, Chen X, Wang C, Zhou P (2025). "Unveiling the masking effect: the role of R&D human capital in collaborative innovation and sustainability". *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-09-2024-0281>

Inkinen, H. (2015). Review of empirical research on intellectual capital and firm performance", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 518-565.

Matos, F. and Edvinsson, L. (2020), "Knowledge people and digital transformation", available at: <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783030403898>.

1  
2  
3 Mercier-Laurent, E. and Edvinsson, L. (2021), "World class cooking for solving global  
4 challenges", available at: [https://www.amazon.com/World-Cooking-Solving-Global-  
5 Challenges-ebook/dp/ B08JPW7PNF](https://www.amazon.com/World-Cooking-Solving-Global-Challenges-ebook/dp/B08JPW7PNF).  
6

7  
8 Mouritsen, J., Bukh, P.N., Larsen, H.T. and Johansen, M.R. (2002), "Developing and managing  
9 knowledge through intellectual capital statements", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 3 No.  
10 1, pp. 10-29.  
11

12  
13 Ordonez, P. and Edvinsson, L. (Eds) (2020), *Intellectual Capital in the Digital Economy*,  
14 available at: [https://www.routledge.com/Intellectual-Capital-in-the-Digital-Economy/Pablos-  
15 Edvinsson/p/ book/9780367250676](https://www.routledge.com/Intellectual-Capital-in-the-Digital-Economy/Pablos-Edvinsson/p/book/9780367250676).  
16

17  
18 Petty, R. and Guthrie, J. (2000). "Intellectual capital literature review: measurement, reporting  
19 and management", *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 155-176.  
20

21  
22 Scuotto, V., Del Giudice, M., and Obi Omeihe, K. (2017). SMEs and Mass Collaborative  
23 Knowledge Management: Toward Understanding the Role of Social Media  
24 Networks. *Information Systems Management*, 34(3), 280-  
25 290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2017.1330006>  
26

27  
28 Scuotto, V., Omeihe, K. O., Cillo, V., & Giudice, M. D. (2025). Tackling the empowerment  
29 of Artificial Intelligence for humanitarian intervention from Save the Children. *Technological  
30 Forecasting and Social Change*, 221, Article 124330. Advance online  
31 publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124330>.  
32

33  
34 Shi D, Xu J, Ding Y (2025), "The effect of executive green human capital on green mergers  
35 and acquisitions". *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-  
36 print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-10-2024-0340>  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60