

## **Leveraging Intellectual Capital in developing countries: Evidence from Kenya**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Intellectual capital (IC) performance is strongly related with the resources available (Verona, 1999, Wernerfelt, 1984). At the same time, IC performance is often the result of individual activity, which questions the extent of the benefits of grouping people in an organization, especially in the presence of a context characterized by multiple communities (Bounfour and Edvinsson, 2005). This issue is particularly crucial in developing countries, where tensions arise between strong ties to traditions and the eagerness to foster innovation. Therefore, this paper aims to better understand how diverse organization's resources in developing countries influence IC performance, in particular by looking at a highly individualistic form of IC performance, namely art creation. It then explores the impact of community aspects on IC performance in relation to the other organization's resources.

An in-depth understanding of organization's resources in relation to IC performance is a crucial issue for developing countries (Andreeva and Garanina, 2016). The latter is characterized by high potential for growth: for instance, the World Bank shows that developing countries' economies grew at 4.3 percent in 2015 and are projected to grow 4.8 percent in 2016, whereas developed economies show a 2.4 percent growth in 2015, which is projected at 2.9 percent in 2016 (World Bank, 2016a). In particular, despite its large heterogeneity, Africa has a large, still unfulfilled, potentiality (AfDB et al., 2016). Developing countries possess a strong connection to their traditions (Abraham, 2015, Iliffe, 2015). This feature could represent a competitive advantage for them, if appropriately valorized. At the same time, it could be a limitation since it could lead to increased rivalry among different communities, discouraging collaboration and sharing of information. Therefore, besides its economic relevance, the study of IC in developing countries is further theoretically motivated by the presence of the peculiar role that the community aspect plays, which needs to be taken into account in understanding the impact of the different resources on IC performance.

1  
2  
3 In this study, IC performance, the result of organization's resources, is measured as art creation.  
4  
5 Art represents one of the most complex results of IC performance (Sgourev, 2013). It is often  
6  
7 performed at individual level, but it requires a broad audience in order to be valorized (Collingwood,  
8  
9 1938, Beardsley, 1965, Sgourev, 2013). Moreover, it is characterized, on the one hand, by the  
10  
11 expectation to disrupt the existing products, and on the other hand it is often strongly connected to  
12  
13 traditional knowledge and culture. The latter plays a crucial role in art creation, and in the way the  
14  
15 related work is organized. This aspect is extremely evident in countries with a strong traditional legacy,  
16  
17 where divisions due to traditional heritage still represent a major source of conflict (Iliffe, 2015).  
18  
19 Furthermore, art represents one of the most important form of IC performance in developing countries,  
20  
21 but is still poorly valorized (Sieber and Walker, 1987). So far, there has been a lack of evidence on the  
22  
23 functioning of organizations grouping together artists, especially in a context characterized by high  
24  
25 rivalry and traditional legacy. Therefore, it is possible to observe that art creation provides an ideal  
26  
27 setting to investigate IC performance.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Overall, a gap exists in the understanding of how organization's resources contribute to IC  
34  
35 performance in developing countries. Resting on the resource-based theory, this paper aims to  
36  
37 investigate (1) how diverse organization's resources impact IC performance in developing countries,  
38  
39 and (2) the impact of the community aspect in relation to the other organization's knowledge resources.  
40  
41 Specifically, the paper considers the following resources, i.e. human, social and organizational, to  
42  
43 investigate the two impacts mentioned above.  
44  
45  
46

47 To address these research questions, this article performs an in-depth case study on an art  
48  
49 school program, named in this work "WE" for anonymity, in Malindi (Kenya). This organization had  
50  
51 been initially launched by an Italian artist as part of a broader project with the scope to promote the  
52  
53 local culture. In particular, it aims to train local artists and to facilitate the international exposure of  
54  
55 their work. This setting provides an ideal field of enquiry since it is characterized by a high level of  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 informality, the presence of strong cultural roots, and communication difficulties that further  
4  
5 exacerbate the tensions among organizations' members in the work creation process.  
6

7  
8 The empirical findings document that multiple organization's resources, i.e., human, social and  
9  
10 organizational, impact IC performance. Social and organizational resources have the largest positive  
11  
12 effect, meaning that grouping together people is beneficial for the final outcome. Furthermore, the  
13  
14 community aspect has an incremental positive role to social capital. Thus, it is possible to infer its role  
15  
16 in facilitating knowledge interactions and creation of networks, which overall positively influence IC  
17  
18 performance.  
19

20  
21 This research represents an attempt to understand organization's resources in IC performance in  
22  
23 developing countries. Moreover, it gathers insights on the influence of community aspects into  
24  
25 relational resources (i.e. social and organizational), further developing IC theory concerning different  
26  
27 institutional and socio-cultural contexts.  
28  
29

30  
31 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the conceptual  
32  
33 framework based on the resource based-view. Section 3 describes the research design used to  
34  
35 investigate the research questions. Section 4 presents the findings. The final Section shows the  
36  
37 evidence gathered and it draws implications for future programs aiming to develop IC in developing  
38  
39 countries, primarily in Africa.  
40  
41  
42  
43

## 44 **2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

45  
46 IC performance is often equated as the result of unique and disruptive knowledge (Nonaka and  
47  
48 Takeuchi, 1995). In fact, IC can be defined as the knowledge resources which create value (Ashton,  
49  
50 2005, Lev, 2000, Meritum, 2002). From an organizational perspective, past literature considers IC as  
51  
52 the outcome of the combination of organization's resources (Andreeva and Garanina, 2016, Nahapiet  
53  
54 and Ghoshal, 1998, Youndt et al., 2004, Wernerfelt, 1984). Subramaniam and Youndt (2005) identify  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 human-based, social-based and organizational-based as the three main sources of organization's  
4  
5 resources.  
6

7  
8 Human resources can be defined as the set of knowledge, skills and abilities at individual level  
9  
10 developed and deployed in order to be productive, effective and innovative (Schultz, 1961). Social  
11  
12 resources are considered as the knowledge which arises through interactions among individuals and  
13  
14 groups of people (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998). Finally, organizational resources can be defined as the  
15  
16 overall institutionalized knowledge and codified experience which are used and shared through systems  
17  
18 and processes (Youndt et al., 2004). Each form of resources is grounded at a different aggregation  
19  
20 level, such as individual, network and organization.  
21  
22

23  
24 Moreover, it is necessary to question the relevance and the relationships among resources when  
25  
26 it comes to IC forms of performance in contexts characterized by informality and community aspects.  
27  
28 The latter are defined as values, spirits and principles apt to bond human capital (North and Kares,  
29  
30 2012, Edvinsson et al., 2005). These contexts may encapsulate potential levels of rivalry and reluctance  
31  
32 to new forms of aggregation. Organizational resources appear as the result of repeated and cooperative  
33  
34 activities (Nelson and Winter, 1982), which are later handed down either verbally or through formal  
35  
36 documents and processes. Differently, social capital is not bound within prescribed parameters, but is  
37  
38 characterized by high flexibility in knowledge and information sharing, and can operate as a leverage to  
39  
40 facilitate the development of human and organizational resources (Kostova and Roth, 2003). Therefore,  
41  
42 it is necessary to further investigate the relationships between relational (i.e., social and organizational)  
43  
44 resources and community aspects, in order to better understand the overall process of IC performance.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Prior literature highlights the relevance of human resources in describing IC outcomes  
50  
51 (Williams, 2001). Our focus is to understand whether the value creation related to IC performance  
52  
53 represents the result of individual activity or if it also benefits from social and organizational  
54  
55 interactions. Our measure of IC performance places an emphasis both on the outcome, i.e., art, and on  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the improvements in terms of value creation of the entity analyzed. Moreover, the high informal  
4 organizational structure of the entity analyzed as well as peculiar characteristics of the industry  
5 investigated do not allow to use more direct measures of value creation, e.g., VAIC (Barathi Kamath,  
6 2007; Williams, 2001).

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 The extent to which people within an organization are willing to share ideas and valuable  
13 information is strictly related to the so-called public good dilemma, where every individual can make  
14 an individual profit by being selfish (Cabrera and Cabrera, 2002, Allison et al., 1996). This attitude is  
15 potentially detrimental to the group's best long-term interests, nullifying the immediate benefits  
16 obtained. In the case analyzed in this study, artists could simply decide to continue working on an  
17 individual basis, with scant collaboration, and with little exploitation or immediate depletion of the  
18 resources available within the organization.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 In fact, art creation shares strong similarities with both radical and incremental innovations,  
29 since on the one hand it depicts a situation in which a completely new product is conceived and  
30 realized, and on the other hand, it can rely on existing/traditional knowledge. Despite the presence of  
31 disruptive elements in art creation, the latter is still the result of a combination of a multitude of  
32 knowledge resources. Moreover, art creation is often performed at local and individual level with poor  
33 results in terms of external exposure and valorization. It is also characterized by the fact that from the  
34 inception or first inspiration of the artist, to the final art creation, subsists a process which in its  
35 development, may be guided and shared until its completion (Beardsley, 1965). Therefore, it is  
36 necessary to question the possible benefits that art creation could obtain by an aggregation of  
37 individuals, and to what extent it draws upon human, social and organizational resources.

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The aforementioned theoretical framework finds its natural ground in the study of IC in  
developing countries. These countries are characterized by a strong connection to their traditional  
values (Bontis, 2004, Seleim and Bontis, 2013). The traditional division in small communities could

1  
2  
3 lead to possible tensions among individuals of different regions as well as reluctance to share  
4 information. At the same time, traditional knowledge can represent an underdeveloped source of  
5 competitive advantage, which could be used to foster IC performance. Moreover, developing countries  
6 may not manage knowledge and IC as developed countries do (Andreeva and Garanina, 2016,  
7 Adekunle Suraj and Bontis, 2012). Developing countries have a lower degree of formality, leading to a  
8 potential central role of individual knowledge and so, IC could still strongly be embedded in the  
9 traditional system. Finally, organizations operating in developing countries often lack financial  
10 resources. The latter is usually considered highly important to create connectivity among individuals,  
11 actors and activities (Marzo and Scarpino, 2016). These characteristics could affect the way knowledge  
12 resources are used. Despite the growing role that these countries are playing in the global economy and  
13 their potential for growth, literature on IC in developing countries is still scant. Past research mainly  
14 focuses on the reporting of IC activities in developing countries, rather than on the use of knowledge  
15 resources (Abeysekera and Guthrie, 2004, Abeysekera and Guthrie, 2005, Chen et al., 2004).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Overall, the aim of this study is to contribute to the current debate on the relationship between  
33 organization's resources and IC performance, investigating art creation, in developing countries. Thus,  
34 this article attempts to address the following research questions:  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 *RQ1. How do organization's resources contribute to improve IC performance in*  
41 *developing countries?*  
42  
43

44 *RQ2. What is the moderating effect of community and relational (i.e. social and*  
45 *organizational) resources on IC performance?*  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 51 **3. RESEARCH DESIGN** 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1  
2  
3 This section presents the methods adopted to conduct this study and the related setting. It then  
4  
5 provides both theoretical and empirical elements to justify the methodological choices. Finally, it  
6  
7 discusses the procedures followed to analyzed the data collected.  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 *3.1 The case study: the WE project* 13

14 To address the research questions, this paper carries out an in-depth case study. The latter is  
15  
16 particularly suited for studying IC performance, considering the uniqueness of each process (Sgourev,  
17  
18 2013, Hargadon and Douglas, 2001). The case-study approach is also appropriate considering its  
19  
20 inclination to explore complex questions, disentangling them with the use of a wide-set of data and  
21  
22 information (Yin, 1994). The analysis includes survey data, both semi-structured and structured  
23  
24 interviews carried out formally and informally, observations and a wide collection of documentation  
25  
26 (e.g. newspapers articles, pictures, reports, web information and other multimedia). The data  
27  
28 triangulation allows us to validate the empirical results and to interpret through a performative  
29  
30 approach (Marzo and Scarpino, 2016, Mouritsen, 2006). Moreover, the complexity of the cultural,  
31  
32 social and economic settings which characterize art creation in Kenya further motivates this  
33  
34 methodological approach (Vale et al., 2016). Table 1 shows the data sources used.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 [PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]  
43  
44  
45

46 The case-study “WE” consists of an art school regrouping Kenyan artists, with different levels  
47  
48 of experience, and directed by an experienced artist. The latter is originally from Italy, but he is strictly  
49  
50 connected to the African cultural and artistic environment. For instance, he has also represented Kenya  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 at the Venice Biennale, an international and important visual art exhibition<sup>1</sup>. The artist/project  
4 founder's Facebook biography clearly highlights the goal of the activities performed in Africa:  
5  
6

7 "Why don't we turn our head to this forgotten world placed under Equator? Why don't we try  
8 to help them to make concrete the huge richness of their land and their souls? Not as missionaries, but  
9 as smart and sincere managers, ready to give and receive."<sup>2</sup>  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 "WE" has been formally recognized by the Kenyan Ministry of Sports, Culture and the Arts in  
17 November 2014. It is based in Malindi (Kenya) and it represents one of the first attempts to gather  
18 together artists from different villages, to produce and sell art works worldwide. The art school is part  
19 of a broader project which aims to promote both the local culture, for instance with the opening of a  
20 museum, and to increase the tourist attractiveness, by developing high quality facilities. At "WE",  
21 artists are further trained and perform their work, usually under the supervision of a more experienced  
22 artist.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Kenya represents an ideal setting to carry out the research on developing countries. In terms of  
33 economic growth, it has performed well in the past decade (World Bank, 2016a). A growing number of  
34 modern services are delivered, primarily financial intermediation and mobile communication, leading  
35 to demand for services different from trade, in turn leaving room for the valorization of IC (World  
36 Bank, 2016b).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

### 46 *3.2 Data collection*

47 The analysis relies on a rich set of data gathered over the period 2015-2016. First, questionnaire  
48 surveys were administered in autumn 2016 to the participants of the project "WE". Respondents were  
49 assured that the answers were used only for research purposes and at aggregate level. Initially, the  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 <sup>1</sup> <http://universes-in-universe.de/car/venezia/bien50/ken/e-tanzini.htm>

57 <sup>2</sup> Facebook page of the artist/project Founder.  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 preliminary questionnaire was piloted to eight different persons<sup>3</sup> to ensure its understandability and  
4  
5 length. The pilot tests lasted between 11 to 45 minutes and they prompted modifications of some  
6  
7 questions. After the first period of piloting, the questionnaires were administered *in locu*, ensuring that  
8  
9 all the addressed people responded. The mean survey duration was less than 24 minutes, ranging  
10  
11 between a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 30 minutes<sup>4</sup>. The internal consistency of the questions was  
12  
13 assessed through Cronbach's alpha; the test results with an alpha mean value of 0.8748 indicating good  
14  
15 consistency (Tavakol and Dennick, 2011, DeVellis, 2016, Nunnally et al., 1967). Cronbach's alpha of  
16  
17 all scales was greater than 0.8635, and when deleting any of the items included in our questionnaire the  
18  
19 overall reliability did not change/improve much, suggesting a good-fit of items; hence all the items  
20  
21 were retained.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The questionnaire consists of a total of 48 questions divided in the following seven sections:  
27  
28 respondents' profile, creativity issues, organizational issues, cultural/artistic issues, knowledge sharing  
29  
30 process, community aspects and personal thoughts of knowledge sharing. The survey method provides  
31  
32 a wider understanding of the underlying characters of the phenomena under investigation and is  
33  
34 particularly suited for the IC studies (Andreeva and Garanina, 2016, St-Pierre and Audet, 2011). The  
35  
36 questionnaire takes a neutral standpoint without including a specific section on the country level  
37  
38 dimension. Indeed, the survey design adopted maximizes the "fitness for use" (Groves et al., 2011) and  
39  
40 facilitates replication and relevance for other studies. Also, from a theoretical perspective, we are  
41  
42 interested in the relationship between organizations' resources and IC performance and not in the  
43  
44 specific local characteristics of the context analyzed. Hence, we adopt a neutral approach to design our  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

---

53 <sup>3</sup> The pilot tests were conducted by: two Accounting Professors, a Post-doc research fellow in statistical sciences, a Ph.D.  
54 student in Finance, a Ph. D. student in Management accounting and intellectual capital, a high-school student, an Architect  
55 and University student in Art and Archeology and a post-graduate student in Art.

56 <sup>4</sup> In literature it is suggested that the respondents' attention reduces following the first 30 minutes (Perecman and Curran,  
57 2006). Hence, we consider the quality of the responses as satisfactory.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 survey questionnaire. See Appendix 1 for the full questionnaire and paragraph 3.3 for the variables,  
4  
5 measurements and operationalization.  
6

7  
8 Secondly, 12 interviews (8 semi-structured interviews and 4 structured) were conducted with  
9  
10 the different members of this organization and its stakeholders (Table 2). It was followed the general  
11  
12 interview guide approach (Patton, 2002: 342) reported in Appendix 2.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17 [PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 2 HERE]  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Interviews lasted on average about 26 minutes, ranging from a minimum of 8 minutes to a  
23  
24 maximum of 90 minutes. They have been recorded, transcribed and translated by the authors if  
25  
26 performed in a language other than English. The translated interviews were then sent to the  
27  
28 interviewees asking to check for any possible misunderstanding or inconsistency. The interviews took  
29  
30 the form of face-to-face conversations, telephone or Skype interviews and completion of written  
31  
32 questionnaires. The twelve interviews are coded with a code from “INT1” to “INT12”. All the  
33  
34 interviewees were almost asked identical questions even though the structure and composition of the  
35  
36 interviews were adapted according to the respondent. Diverse interviewees may have diverse  
37  
38 perceptions on the IC performance and may provide important insights. Also, the same subjects have  
39  
40 been interviewed more than once to assess the reliability over time of the responses. The results  
41  
42 reported are integrated with extracts from interviews, introducing a narrative perspective (Corbetta,  
43  
44 2003).  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Thirdly, this study combines the use of participant observations to gather further data and to  
50  
51 allow the researchers a full immersion in the case-study. This method is particularly important within  
52  
53 the interpretative paradigm, prompting a social awareness from the “participants” standpoint through  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 taking part in their lives. This can actually only be realized through continuous interaction between the  
4  
5 subjects studied and the researcher (Corbetta, 2003).  
6

7  
8 In detail, by visiting the laboratories and warehouses of the artist/project founder in Italy, the  
9  
10 researchers were able to assess the participants' subjective reporting in the interviews. The researchers  
11  
12 contextualized more accurately in this sense, the narrative interchange occurring, and the physical,  
13  
14 social and cultural contexts in which the participant lives for a great part of the time (Musante and  
15  
16 DeWalt, 2010).  
17

18  
19 Fourthly, internal material directly provided by the organization is also used, such as the Statute  
20  
21 of the organization, emails and other internal documents discussing work organization. Finally,  
22  
23 additional data concerning this project on media were gathered, i.e., press articles, blogs, and various  
24  
25 social media (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and Youtube). Press articles were collected through the  
26  
27 software Factiva looking for relevant keywords to the field of enquiry by looking at press articles in  
28  
29 English, French and Italian over the last ten years. Forty-six articles were retained and analyzed.  
30  
31

### 32 33 34 35 *3.3. Data analysis and variable definition* 36

37  
38 This paper adopts a mix methods approach to analyze the data gathered. First, it performs a  
39  
40 quantitative analysis of the questionnaire survey. Past studies demonstrate the reliability of this  
41  
42 technique in order to investigate the use of IC at firm level (Tsai, 2002, Handzic et al., 2016). It then  
43  
44 complements the results obtained from the analysis of the questionnaire survey with the interviews  
45  
46 performed, as well as with observations and internal and external documents. Contextual information  
47  
48 has been useful to further corroborate the results. The main advantage of this methodological approach  
49  
50 is the possibility to triangulate the different findings and thereby validate them.  
51  
52

53  
54 The fifty survey questionnaires obtained were analyzed according to the following procedure.  
55  
56 First, the different responses were aggregated in order to identify the underlying phenomenon  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 characterizing organization's resources and IC performance. To this end, a Factor Analysis was  
4 performed. This technique presents the advantage of uncovering the main underlying dimensions and  
5 reducing the data to reach a more parsimonious comprehension of the determined variables, by setting  
6 the number and nature of components necessary to consider the patterns of observed correlations  
7 (Hayton et al., 2004). The factor analysis, indeed, is particularly worthy for scale development, which  
8 is the case for this study, and where there is scant theoretical basis to identify a preconceived number of  
9 components (Hurley et al., 1997). To decide the number of factors to retain, a parallel analysis was  
10 performed, which suggest to hold five components. However, cautiously and consistent with prior  
11 literature on IC, only the first four common factors were retained in the analysis (Hayton et al., 2004).  
12 Also retaining a limited number of factors does not reduce the interpretation of the information  
13 provided<sup>5</sup> (see the paragraphs on the variables measurements for a more exhaustive definition of the  
14 four components).

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
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

Once determined, the proxy to measure the main sources of IC, the following stage of the analysis used regression analysis.

#### *Variables measurements*

To determine the dependent variable (IC Performance) in the factor analysis, the three main questions regarding the creativity issues are analyzed, i.e., CREATIVE, CREATE and ART\_TR.

The independent variables were extracted from the factor analysis, including all the questions except those regarding the respondents' profile. The results of the factor analysis highlight the main common factors recognized amongst organization's resources, namely human, social, and

---

<sup>5</sup> The cumulative amount of variance explained account for the 0.68. The decision was based considering also eigenvalues higher than 0.3 and Cattell's (1966) scree test, identifying a "cliff" after the fourth component.

1  
2  
3 organizational. In detail, the HUMAN variable is mainly made up of questions on the individual  
4 perceptions of creativity issues, the cultural background of the individual and the time he/she spends  
5 working and creating. The SOCIAL component includes questions which best represent the individual  
6 interaction with other individuals and the role and relations with other people. For instance, this  
7 variable comprises the willingness to listen to other people or the way the individual faces and solves  
8 problems and the willingness to share knowledge with others. A third component depicts the  
9 ORGANIZATIONAL resources. This variable chiefly embodies the institutionalized practices and  
10 procedures resulting in codified structures and knowledge. It is indeed made up of questions on  
11 whether the working environment supports the process of knowledge sharing or whether the tools and  
12 spaces in the working environment facilitate the information transfer among workers. It also includes  
13 the respondent's attitude towards organizing and writing down ideas or projects as well as the attitude  
14 towards performing the work individually or in a group as part of an organization. Finally, component  
15 four designates the COMMUNITY system of beliefs. As a matter of fact, it evokes the reciprocal  
16 feeling amongst colleagues such as their perceptions of the judgement of their work by others, the  
17 degree of knowledge amongst colleagues and if they feel encouraged by others in pursuing their work.  
18 It also relates to the perceptions of the relation between creativity and community aspects, e.g. if  
19 creativity is a characteristic only of eminent people, or if it can be taught, assessed and developed in  
20 schools.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 The study then explores the interaction between the COMMUNITY and SOCIAL variables to  
46 verify the community role in exacerbating or moderating the social effect on the performance of  
47 intellectual capital. A similar relation investigates the interaction between COMMUNITY and  
48 ORGANIZATIONAL effect on the dependent variable.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The analysis considers several variables as controls. In detail, it includes the respondent's AGE, SEX and EDUCATION. Additionally, we asked about the GROUP of the population to which the respondent belongs and the primary type of art performed (ARTTYPE).

Table 3 summarizes the description of the variables used in this study.

[PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 3 HERE]

### *The models*

Once the different elements have been aggregated, the relationships with the variables identified have been analyzed through OLS regression with robust standard errors clustered at individual level. Model 1a represents the baseline model investigating the relationship between the three capital resources (HUMAN, SOCIAL and ORGANIZATIONAL) and the intellectual capital performance (IC\_Performance). Model 1b adds the control variables regarding the respondents' profile. Finally, Model 2 introduces the community aspect (COMMUNITY) and two interaction terms with the COMMUNITY independent variables, i.e. COMMUNITY\*SOCIAL and COMMUNITY\*ORGANIZATIONAL.

#### *Model 1a*

$$IC\_Performance = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HUMAN + \beta_2 SOCIAL + \beta_3 ORGANIZATIONAL + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

#### *Model 1b*

$$IC\_Performance = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HUMAN + \beta_2 SOCIAL + \beta_3 ORGANIZATIONAL + \beta_5 AGE + \beta_6 SEX + \beta_7 EDUCATION + \beta_8 ARTTYPE + \beta_9 GROUP + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

*Model 2*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{IC\_Performance} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{HUMAN} + \beta_2 \text{SOCIAL} + \beta_3 \text{ORGANIZATIONAL} + \beta_4 \text{COMMUNITY} \\
 & \beta_5 \text{COMMUNITY} * \text{SOCIAL} + \beta_6 \text{COMMUNITY} * \text{ORGANIZATIONAL} + \beta_7 \text{AGE} + \beta_8 \text{SEX} + \\
 & \beta_9 \text{EDUCATION} + \beta_{10} \text{ARTTYPE} + \beta_{11} \text{GROUP} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

The variables included in the models are explained above and summarized in Table 3.

Interviews and internal and external documents were then analyzed as follows. The material collected was first reviewed in order to identify the macro-themes related to the field of enquiry. Afterwards, an exhaustive coding form to re-examine the material collected was performed, focusing on the organization's knowledge resources, and the art creation. The primary scope of this further exploration is to support and corroborate the findings from the regression analysis. All the evidence gathered from the data is the result of the joint discussion of all researchers involved in this study in order to ensure the validity of the findings reported.

#### 4. FINDINGS

This section presents the results gathered from the data analysis. It first provides evidence of the impact of organization's resources in leveraging IC. It then presents how knowledge resources are related to the community aspects. In both cases, the results from the analysis of the survey questionnaires are initially presented. These findings are complemented and clarified by the evidence obtained from analysis of the interviews and of the other documentation.

##### 4.1 Organization's knowledge resources: a multidimensional situation

1  
2  
3 The presence of multiple resources within the organization is confirmed by the analysis  
4 conducted. Table 4 Column 1 reports the results with the baseline model. Human, social and  
5 organizational resources are positively and significantly related to IC performance. Among the  
6 different variables, social and organizational resources have the largest effect over IC performance.  
7 These results are robust to the inclusion of several control variables concerning the socio-demographic  
8 characteristics of the respondents (Table 4 Column 2).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 [PLEASE, INSERT TABLE 4 HERE]  
20  
21  
22

23 The role of human, social, and organizational resources in influencing IC performance also  
24 emerges from the analysis of the other material collected. The human skills and knowledge applied to  
25 art are particularly strong in the Kenyan context, thanks also to a long tradition of art creation. One  
26 collaborator of the project says:  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 “As I said, there are men with diverse roles but with common denominators: love and  
33 sensibility; if these positive men, ready to give to the other without asking for something back  
34 communicate, it triggers a process of social growth”. [INT2]  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Social capital is considered as one of the key characteristics of the “WE” project, to the level  
40 that it is externally perceived and appreciated. A buyer, who repeatedly visited the organization in  
41 Kenya, affirmed:  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 “The organization “WE”, can be considered as a schools of Art, whatever art form it may be,  
47 serve to teach technique, to share ideas with peers and ultimately to unlock potential”. [INT10]  
48  
49  
50

51 The importance of the organizational aspect, and its value added on IC performance, is strongly  
52 emphasized by the numerous actors involved in the project, as well as in the definition of the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 workspace. The young craftsmen are expected to constantly present their creations to the Project  
4  
5 Founder and to the rest of the organization. As one collaborator said:

6  
7        “[The young craftsmen begin to attend] the art organizations laboratories. Paintings, sculpture,  
8  
9 photography, texture and leather laboratories. Laboratories where you can teach, learn, exchange ideas  
10  
11 and vision, invent...laboratories where they can consult present and past testimonies in the form of art,  
12  
13 books, photographs, movies, music and food. Thanks to the dedicated areas: museum, library, game  
14  
15 room and canteen” [INT2].  
16  
17

18  
19        Overall, the empirical findings document that multiple organization’s resources, i.e., human,  
20  
21 social and organizational, impact IC performance, with a different degree of impact.  
22  
23

#### 24 25 26 4.2 Unfolding the community aspect to leverage IC

27  
28        The results regarding the impact of community aspects on IC performance are reported in Table  
29  
30 4 Column (3). The focus is on the interaction between community and relational resources (i.e., social  
31  
32 and organizational). First, the relation between community aspects and social capital is significant and  
33  
34 positive, showing the incremental effect on IC performance. Secondly, the relation between community  
35  
36 and organization capital is not significant, meaning that their interaction has no impact on IC  
37  
38 performance. The explanation power of the model is satisfactory (R-Squared 85.40%).  
39  
40

41  
42        The community represents a fundamental element of the project and is embedded in its creation  
43  
44 and functioning. The artist/project manager affirms that the choice to initially locate the organization in  
45  
46 Malindi was motivated “by the presence of numerous races and religions. It is one of the oldest towns  
47  
48 on Kenyan Coast.” [INT1]<sup>6</sup>  
49  
50

51  
52        Moreover, the willingness to share information and to interact is part of the community values.  
53  
54 Illustrative is a quote of Employee and former Art-student within the project:  
55  
56

57  
58 <sup>6</sup><http://archivio.panorama.it/archivio/La-mia-Africa-salvata-dagli-artisti>  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 “We do like sharing our knowledge because we believe in the proverb which says that one stone  
4 cannot support a cooking pot. African artists like collaborating through sharing ideas.” [INT8]  
5  
6

7 At the same time, there is still distrust towards the organizational aggregation among local  
8 communities “Creativity has never been transcribed. [...] Local people are really good artists, but they  
9 lack of organizations. They often have short-term goals.” [INT 1]. Even in their daily organizations,  
10 one of the major difficulties is the definition of routines or systematization of practices.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 **6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

24 The first goal of this study is to better understand how organization’s resources could contribute  
25 to improve IC performance in developing countries. The latter presents intrinsic characteristics which  
26 may influence the relationship between organization’s resources and IC performance. Through the use  
27 of quantitative and qualitative approaches, the study triangulates the results from survey responses,  
28 interviews, direct observations and the use of other documents providing both theoretical and practical  
29 contributions.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The findings show that human, social and organizational resources influence IC performance. It  
40 is therefore remarkable that the different levels of aggregation play a role in the final outcome. In  
41 particular, the largest effects are attributed to the social and organizational resources. The aggregation  
42 of people is beneficial to IC performance, overcoming individual differences. Therefore, the results are  
43 consistent across different degrees of aggregation; i.e., network and organization level. This result is  
44 consistent with the idea that organizations group together people in an attempt at collective  
45 achievement to increase the likelihood of higher IC performance (Allen, 1977). The possibility of  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 social interaction as well as the codification of practices and routines, leads individuals to gain further  
4  
5 access to new information and knowledge.  
6

7  
8 Therefore, an increased intensification of aggregation in work organizations could represent an  
9  
10 interesting and valid path to undertake towards sustainable and positive growth. The presence of an  
11  
12 organized workspace, adequate tools, and codified practice are extremely beneficial in supporting the  
13  
14 improvement of IC resources' performance in developing countries. This type of initiative could also  
15  
16 be initially started by non-local people, as long as the socio-cultural context is well-understood, as in  
17  
18 the case under analysis. The evidence gathered is particularly significant, especially considering the  
19  
20 setting analyzed, art creation, which has a strong individual component in its process creation.  
21  
22

23  
24 Secondly, this study addresses the question of the impact of community aspects on IC  
25  
26 performance. In particular, the focus is on the interaction with the relational capital (i.e., social and  
27  
28 organizational). The results document that the community aspects encourage and facilitate IC  
29  
30 performance, allowing for integration amongst individuals and their interactions and networks.  
31  
32 Therefore, these findings contradict the view that community aspects may represent a major source of  
33  
34 rivalry, which would have discouraged or impeded knowledge sharing. In this light, it is possible to  
35  
36 infer its role in facilitating knowledge interactions and creation of networks, which overall positively  
37  
38 influence IC performance.  
39  
40

41  
42 At the same time, it emerges that the community aspects have no incremental effect on  
43  
44 organizational capital. This fact can be explained by the high degree of informality that has  
45  
46 characterized developing countries for a longtime. The evidence gathered shows that informal  
47  
48 coordination is strongly embedded in individuals' routines. Nevertheless, community aspects do not  
49  
50 hamper the added value of formal mechanisms characterizing the organizational capital.  
51  
52

53  
54 The contributions of this study are manifold. First, this paper provides a better understanding  
55  
56 on how organization's resources lead to IC performance in a developing country, namely Kenya. By  
57  
58

1  
2  
3 looking to a setting characterized by a high degree of complexity, these findings address the call for  
4  
5 more empirical research on the link between resources and IC performance (Subramaniam and Youndt,  
6  
7 2005). Moreover, differently from Andreeva and Garanina (2016), this study shows the positive impact  
8  
9 of relational capital in facilitating interactions among individuals, with a positive impact on IC  
10  
11 performance. The presence of discrepancies shows the relevance of regional differences among  
12  
13 developing countries concerning relational elements.  
14  
15

16  
17 Secondly, these findings contribute to the understanding of community aspects in IC  
18  
19 performance. This aspect is further emphasized by its positive interaction with social resources, and its  
20  
21 lack of relation to organizational aspects. These findings help to unfold the contribution of community  
22  
23 aspects, especially in developing countries, where community values, spirit and principles play a key  
24  
25 role in society nowadays.  
26  
27

28  
29 Thirdly, this study addresses the call for more research on programs implemented at  
30  
31 organizational level to leverage IC. It provides empirical evidence on how a group of artists, originally  
32  
33 from different Kenyan communities, collaborate and jointly work together in an organized setting. The  
34  
35 networks and interactions among individuals as well as the codification of experience and practices  
36  
37 have a beneficial result on IC performance, and so, foster the economy. Moreover, this study also sheds  
38  
39 lights on one of the main challenges of IC performance, namely the valorization of traditional  
40  
41 knowledge, in this case art creation, and making it concrete and sustainable in less developed areas of  
42  
43 the world.  
44  
45

46  
47 Like all studies, this research is not without its limitations. First, it is based on a single  
48  
49 organization in a particular setting. We caution the reader to generalize our results due to peculiarities  
50  
51 of our setting. Future studies could examine the possible influence of local peculiarities due to the  
52  
53 legal, social, cultural and economic context, for instance by performing a comparative study. The  
54  
55 transformation from “mono-artist (or mono-producer)” to “active and group artists” widens the appeal  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and is key to value co-creation. Value derives from the interactions of personal experiences,  
4 experiments, emotions, symbolic and non-utilitarian aspects of creation (Payne et al., 2008; Edvardsson  
5 et al., 2011). Given the relevance of the joint and collaborative process in generating IC in developing  
6 countries, future research could adopt the co-creation theoretical model. The latter would help to  
7 further uncover the material and symbolic aspects of social interactions which shape IC performance.  
8 Secondly, the measures of resources adopted may have been influenced by the early stage which  
9 characterized the organization investigated and the relevance of the informal interactions among co-  
10 workers. It could be interesting to complement and compare our results by looking at how  
11 organizations externally report their IC performance. Ultimately, IC performance is a nuanced and  
12 multifaceted construct. Because of the inherent difficulties in measuring IC performance, we use a  
13 measure based on multiple elements, i.e., art creations, creativity and art training. Despite the use of  
14 prior literature (Williams, 2001; Chen Goh, 2005; Barathi Kamath, 2007) and the personal knowledge  
15 of the researchers involved of the setting, we acknowledge that with this measure we probably capture  
16 most of the aspects concerning IC performance of the case study analyzed.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
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

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 ABEYSEKERA, I. & GUTHRIE, J. 2004. Human capital reporting in a developing nation. *The British*  
7 *Accounting Review*, 36, 251-268.
- 8 ABEYSEKERA, I. & GUTHRIE, J. 2005. An empirical investigation of annual reporting trends of  
9 intellectual capital in Sri Lanka. *Critical Perspectives on accounting*, 16, 151-163.
- 10  
11 ABRAHAM, W. E. 2015. *The mind of Africa*, Sub-Saharan Publishers.
- 12  
13 ADEKUNLE SURAJ, O. & BONTIS, N. 2012. Managing intellectual capital in Nigerian  
14 telecommunications companies. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 13, 262-282.
- 15  
16 AFDB, OECD & UNDP 2016. African Economic Outlook 2016. Paris: AfDB, OECD & UNDP.
- 17  
18 ALLEN, T. J. 1977. *Managing the flow of technology: technology transfer and the dissemination of*  
19 *technological information within the R&D organization*, Cambridge, The MIT Press.
- 20  
21 ALLISON, S. T., BEGGAN, J. K. & MIDGLEY, E. H. 1996. The quest for "similar instances" and"  
22 simultaneous possibilities": Metaphors in social dilemma research. *Journal of Personality and*  
23 *Social Psychology*, 71, 479.
- 24  
25 ANDREEVA, T. & GARANINA, T. 2016. Do all elements of intellectual capital matter for  
26 organizational performance? Evidence from Russian context. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*,  
27 17, 397-412.
- 28  
29 ASHTON, R. H. 2005. Intellectual capital and value creation: a review. *Journal of accounting*  
30 *literature*, 24, 53.
- 31  
32 BARATHI KAMATH, G. 2007. The intellectual capital performance of the Indian banking sector.  
33 *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 8(1), 96-123.
- 34  
35 BEARDSLEY, M. C. 1965. On the creation of art. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 23,  
36 291-304.
- 37  
38 BOUNFOUR, A. & EDVINSSON, L. 2005. Intellectual capital for communities. Oxford:  
39 Butterworth-Heinemann. Elsevier.
- 40  
41 BONTIS, N. 2004. National intellectual capital index: a United Nations initiative for the Arab region.  
42 *Journal of Intellectual capital*, 5, 13-39.
- 43  
44 CABRERA, A. & CABRERA, E. F. 2002. Knowledge-sharing dilemmas. *Organization studies*, 23,  
45 687-710.
- 46  
47 CATTELL, R. B. 1966. The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1,  
48 245-276.
- 49  
50 CHEN GOH, P. 2005. Intellectual capital performance of commercial banks in Malaysia. *Journal of*  
51 *intellectual capital*, 6(3), 385-396.
- 52  
53 CHEN, J., ZHU, Z. & YUAN XIE, H. 2004. Measuring intellectual capital: a new model and empirical  
54 study. *Journal of Intellectual capital*, 5, 195-212.
- 55  
56 COLLINGWOOD, R. 1938. *The Principles of Art*. London: Oxford University Press.
- 57  
58 CORBETTA, P. 2003. *Social research: Theory, methods and techniques*, Sage.
- 59  
60 DEVELLIS, R. F. 2016. *Scale development: Theory and applications*, Thousand Okas, Sage  
publications.

- 1  
2  
3 EDVARDSSON, B., TRONVOLL, B. & GRUBER, T. 2011. Expanding understanding of service  
4 exchange and value co-creation: a social construction approach. *Journal of the Academy of*  
5 *Marketing Science* 39 (2):327-339.  
6  
7 EDVINSSON, L., HOFMAN-BANG, P. & JACOBSEN, K. 2005. Intellectual capital in waiting-a  
8 strategic IC challenge. *Handbook of Business Strategy*, 6, 133-140.  
9  
10 GROVES, R. M., FOWLER JR, F. J., COUPER, M. P., LEPKOWSKI, J. M., SINGER, E. &  
11 TOURANGEAU, R. 2011. *Survey methodology*. Vol. 561: John Wiley & Sons.  
12  
13 HANDZIC, M., DURMIC, N., KRALJIC, A., KRALJIC, T. & CHASE, R. 2016. An empirical  
14 investigation of the relationship between intellectual capital and project success. *Journal of*  
15 *Intellectual Capital*, 17.  
16  
17 HARGADON, A. B. & DOUGLAS, Y. 2001. When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the  
18 design of the electric light. *Administrative science quarterly*, 46, 476-501.  
19  
20 HAYTON, J. C., ALLEN, D. G. & SCARPELLO, V. 2004. Factor retention decisions in exploratory  
21 factor analysis: A tutorial on parallel analysis. *Organizational research methods*, 7, 191-205.  
22  
23 HURLEY, A. E., SCANDURA, T. A., SCHRIESHEIM, C. A., BRANNICK, M. T., SEERS, A.,  
24 VANDENBERG, R. J. & WILLIAMS, L. J. 1997. Exploratory and confirmatory factor  
25 analysis: Guidelines, issues, and alternatives. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 18, 667-683.  
26  
27 ILIFFE, J. 2015. *Emergence of African Capitalism*, Springer.  
28  
29 KOSTOVA, T. & ROTH, K. 2003. Social capital in multinational corporations and a micro-macro  
30 model of its formation. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 297-317.  
31  
32 LEV, B. 2000. *Intangibles: Management, measurement, and reporting*, Brookings Institution Press.  
33  
34 MARZO, G. & SCARPINO, E. 2016. Exploring intellectual capital management in SMEs: an in-depth  
35 Italian case study. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17, 27-51.  
36  
37 MERITUM, P. 2002. Guidelines for managing and reporting on intangibles. *Fundación Airtel-*  
38 *Vodafone*.  
39  
40 MOURITSEN, J. 2006. Problematising intellectual capital research: ostensive versus performative IC.  
41 *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 19, 820-841.  
42  
43 MUSANTE, K. & DEWALT, B. R. 2010. *Participant observation: A guide for fieldworkers*, Rowman  
44 Altamira.  
45  
46 NAHAPIET, J. & GHOSHAL, S. 1998. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational  
47 advantage. *Academy of management review*, 23, 242-266.  
48  
49 NELSON, R. R. & WINTER, S. G. 1982. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*, Cambridge,  
50 Harvard University Press.  
51  
52 NONAKA, I. & TAKEUCHI, H. 1995. *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies*  
53 *create the dynamics of innovation*, London, Oxford university press.  
54  
55 NORTH, K. & KARES, S. 2012. Ragusa or how to measure ignorance: The ignorance meter.  
56 *Intellectual Capital for Communities*, 348, 253-264.  
57  
58 NUNNALLY, J. C., BERNSTEIN, I. H. & BERGE, J. M. T. 1967. *Psychometric theory*, JSTOR.  
59  
60 PATTON, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Thousand Oaks,  
CA, Sage.

- 1  
2  
3 PAYNE, A. F., STORBACKA, K. & FROW, P. 2008. Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal of*  
4 *the Academy of Marketing Science* 36 (1):83-96.  
5  
6 PERECMAN, E. & CURRAN, S. R. 2006. *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research. Essays &*  
7 *Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods*, Sage Publications.  
8  
9 SCHULTZ, T. W. 1961. Investment in human capital. *The American economic review*, 1-17.  
10  
11 SELEIM, A. & BONTIS, N. 2013. National intellectual capital and economic performance: empirical  
12 evidence from developing countries. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 20, 131-140.  
13  
14 SGOUREV, S. V. 2013. How Paris gave rise to Cubism (and Picasso): Ambiguity and fragmentation in  
15 radical innovation. *Organization Science*, 24, 1601-1617.  
16  
17 SIEBER, R. & WALKER, R. A. 1987. *African art in the cycle of life*, Washington, Smithsonian Books.  
18  
19 ST-PIERRE, J. & AUDET, J. 2011. Intangible assets and performance: Analysis on manufacturing  
20 SMEs. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 12, 202-223.  
21  
22 SUBRAMANIAM, M. & YOUNDT, M. A. 2005. The influence of intellectual capital on the types of  
23 innovative capabilities. *Academy of Management journal*, 48, 450-463.  
24  
25 TAVAKOL, M. & DENNICK, R. 2011. Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of*  
26 *medical education*, 2, 53.  
27  
28 TSAI, W. 2002. Social structure of “coopetition” within a multiunit organization: Coordination,  
29 competition, and intraorganizational knowledge sharing. *Organization science*, 13, 179-190.  
30  
31 VALE, J., BRANCO, M. C. & RIBEIRO, J. 2016. Individual intellectual capital versus collective  
32 intellectual capital in a meta-organization. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17, 279-297.  
33  
34 VERONA, G. 1999. A resource-based view of product development. *Academy of management review*,  
35 24, 132-142.  
36  
37 WERNERFELT, B. 1984. A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 5, 171-  
38 180.  
39  
40 WILLIAMS, S. M. 2001. Is intellectual capital performance and disclosure practices related?. *Journal*  
41 *of Intellectual capital*, 2(3), 192-203.  
42  
43 WORLD BANK 2016a. Global Outlook: Disappointments, Risks, and Spillovers. *Global Economic*  
44 *Prospects*. Washington: World Bank.  
45  
46 WORLD BANK 2016b. Kenya Country Memorandum: From Economic Growth to Jobs and Shared  
47 Prosperity. Washington: World Bank.  
48  
49 YIN, R. 1994. Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills: CA: Sage publishing.  
50  
51 YOUNDT, M. A., SUBRAMANIAM, M. & SNELL, S. A. 2004. Intellectual capital profiles: An  
52 examination of investments and returns. *Journal of Management studies*, 41, 335-361.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
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

**Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to thank the Artist for his valuable enthusiasm and continuous suggestions. We are also indebted to the cooperation of the respondents and especially to the assistance given by Susan who administered a great part of the data collection phase of this research directly in Kenya. We thank Graciela Carrasco and David Mark Kelly for providing excellent research assistance. The responsibility for the contents of this paper nonetheless remains entirely that of the authors. The helpful comments of the anonymous referee are also greatly acknowledged.

Journal of Intellectual Capital

**Table 1 – Data sources**

Data sources (numbers in parentheses)	Details
Questionnaires	50
Formal interviews (number of interviews performed): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Artist/Project Founder (4)</li> <li>• Collaborator (2)</li> <li>• Employee and former Art-student within the project (2)</li> <li>• Restorer, Framers and Art-dealer (1)</li> <li>• Art-Dealer (1)</li> <li>• Photographer and former student of the Artist (1)</li> <li>• Buyer (1)</li> </ul>	12
Informal interviews to the Artist/Project Founder, employees, collaborator, artists' friends, etc.	> 30
Observations <i>in locu</i> (laboratories, exhibitions, etc.) (days)	≅ 30
Documents collected (newspapers, projects, internal documents, multimedia, social media, other) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Press articles obtained from Factiva (46 press articles)</li> <li>• Internal documents (emails, notes, memos, statute)</li> <li>• Websites</li> <li>• Photos (exhibitions, workplace, warehouses)</li> <li>• Video (2)</li> <li>• Social media (Facebook, Twitter, Youtube and Instagram)</li> </ul>	Several

**Table 2 – Interviews**

<b>Formal interviews</b>	12	Interview Code
<b>Semi-structured</b>	8	
The Artist/Project Founder	1	INT1
The collaborator	1	INT2
The Restorer, Framer and Art-dealer	1	INT3
The Artist/Project Founder	1	INT4
Art-dealer	1	INT5
Photographer and former student of the Artist	1	INT6
The collaborator	1	INT7
Employee and former Art-student within the project	1	INT8
<b>Structured</b>	4	
The Artist/Project Founder	1	INT9
Buyer	1	INT10
Employee and former Art-student within the project	1	INT11
The Artist/Project Founder	1	INT12
<b>Informal interviews</b> to the Artist/Project Founder, Employee and former Art-student within the project, collaborators, artists, friends, etc.	> 30	Not coded

**Table 3 – Variables label, definition, measurement and function**

<b>Label</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Measurement (refer to table)</b>	<b>Function</b>
IC_Performance	Output of intellectual capital in terms of art creations, creativity and art training.	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis of three questions (CREATIVE, CREATE, ART_TR)	Dependent Variable
HUMAN	Knowledge, skills, and abilities of the individuals (Schultz, 1961).	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis of all the questions except those relating to the respondents profile.	Independent Variable, Test
SOCIAL	Knowledge integrated amongst individuals and their relationships developed through interactions, networks, etc. (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998)	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis of all the questions except those relating to the respondents profile.	Independent Variable, Test
ORGANIZATIONAL	The institutionalized knowledge and codified experience within and used by means of manuals, structures, systems, databases, practices and processes (Youndt et al., 2004).	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis of all the questions except those relating to the respondents profile.	Independent Variable, Test
COMMUNITY	Community values, spirit and principles apt to bond human capital with different resources generating cohesion (Edvinsson, 2005; North and Kares, 2005).	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis of all the questions except those relating to the respondents profile.	Independent Variable, Test
COMMUNITY *SOCIAL	Community moderating effect on the social resources.	Interaction term between COMMUNITY and SOCIAL.	Independent Variable, Test
COMMUNITY *ORGANIZATIONAL	Community moderating effect on the organizational resources.	Interaction term between COMMUNITY and ORGANIZATIONAL.	Independent Variable, Test
AGE	Respondents' age.	Continuous variable, age of the respondents.	Control Variable

SEX	Respondents' sex.	Dummy, 0 if the respondent is male, 1 otherwise.	Control Variable
EDUCATION	It summarises the level of education attained and the field of education.	Composite variable deriving from the factor analysis (EDU_L and EDU_F).	Control Variable
ARTTYPE	The type of arts or cultural activities performed by respondents.	Categorical variable from 1 to 12, according to diverse art and cultural activities.	Control Variable
GROUP	Population group in which respondents classify (i.e. <i>Black African; Coloured; Indian or Asian; White; Other</i> ).	Categorical variable from 1 to 5.	Control Variable

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
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

Table 4 – IC performance, organization's resources and community aspects

VARIABLES	(1) IC_Performance	(2) IC_Performance	(3) IC_Performance
<b>HUMAN</b>	<b>0.192***</b> (0.032)	<b>0.248***</b> (0.036)	<b>0.246***</b> (0.042)
<b>SOCIAL</b>	<b>0.455***</b> (0.037)	<b>0.387***</b> (0.047)	<b>0.413***</b> (0.058)
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL</b>	<b>0.376***</b> (0.020)	<b>0.353***</b> (0.028)	<b>0.347***</b> (0.027)
COMMUNITY			0.021 (0.071)
<b>SOCIAL*COMMUNITY</b>			<b>0.099*</b> (0.058)
<b>ORGANIZATIONAL*COMMUNITY</b>			<b>-0.016</b> (0.059)
AGE		0.002 (0.006)	0.000 (0.006)
SEX		0.287** (0.123)	0.273** (0.110)
EDU		0.454 (0.324)	0.570 (0.342)
ART_TYPE		0.030* (0.015)	0.032* (0.017)
POP_GROUP		0.051 (0.036)	0.032 (0.046)
Constant	0.036 (0.047)	-0.592* (0.321)	-0.514 (0.343)
Observations	50	50	50
R-squared	0.790	0.835	0.854
Prob>F	0.000	0.000	0.000

Robust standard errors in parentheses  
Significance levels\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

## Appendix 1 – Survey questionnaire

Questions	Label
<b>Section 1: Respondents' profile</b>	
Age	AGE
Sex [1-2; 1: male; 2: female]	SEX
My level of education attained [1-5; 1: No schooling; 2: elementary schools; 3: professional school; 4: high school; 5: university].	EDU_L
My field of education [if any] [1-18; 1: Agriculture; 2: Architecture or Environments Design; 3: Arts, Visual or Performing; 4: Business, Commerce or Management Sciences; 5: Communication; 6: Computer Sciences; 7: Education, Training or Development; 8: Engineering; 9: Health Care; 10: Home Economics; 11: Language; 12: Law; 13: Mathematical Sciences; 14: Philosophy, Religion or Theology; 15: Physical education or Leisure; 16: Psychology; 17: Public Administration or Social Services; 18: Other]	EDU_F
My years of professional experience [a-c; a: < 1 year; b: 1-5 years; c: > 5 years].	EXP
Describe yourself in terms of population group [1-5; 1: Black Africa; 2: Coloured; 3: Indian or Asian; 4: White; 5: Other].	POP_GROUP
<b>Section 2: Creativity issues</b>	
The type(s) of arts and cultural activities I perform are [up to 3 choices] [1-; 1: Architecture; 2: Crafts; 3: Dance; 4: Design Arts; 5: Media Arts (film, audio, video); 6: Music; 7: New Media (e.g. computer graphics); 8: Painting/Drawing; 9: Photography; 10: Sculpture; 11: Theatre/Cinema; 12: Other]	ART_TYPE
I am creative [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	CREATIVE
I try to create something [1-4; 1: every day; 2: several times a week; 3: several times a month; 4: never]	CREATE
I have noticed an evolution/change in my creativity since I start working with the Artist/Project Founder [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	ART_TR
Creativity is a skill that can be applied to every domain of knowledge [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_KNOW
Creativity is only relevant to visual arts, music, drama and artistic performance [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_FIELD
Creativity is a characteristic of eminent people only [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_EMINENT
Creativity is an inborn talent [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_INBORN
Creativity varies according to age groups [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_AGE
Creativity is the ability to produce something original [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_ORIGINAL
Creativity is about finding connections between things that have not been connected before [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_CONN
Creativity is the ability to produce something of value [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_VALUE
Creativity can be taught [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_TAUGHT
Creativity can be assessed [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_ASS
Creativity is a fundamental skill to be developed in school [1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]	C_SCHOOL
<b>Section 3: Organizational issues</b>	
My Role within the organization is [1-4; 1: staff; 2: employee; 3: student; 4:	ROLE

1		
2		
3	<i>other]</i>	
4	I have worked/studied in this organization for [ <i>a-d; a: &lt; 1 year; b: 1-2 years; c: 3-5 years; d: &gt; 5 years]</i>	TENURE
5		
6	Per day I normally work in this organization [ <i>a-c; a: &lt; 6 hours; b: 6-9 hours; c: &gt; 9 hours]</i>	HOUR
7		
8	Per week I normally work in this organization [ <i>a: 1-3 days per week; b: 4-5 days; c: &gt; 5 days]</i>	DAYS
9		
10	My work is performed [ <i>1-3; 1: indoor; 2: outdoor; 3: both]</i>	IN_OUT
11		
12	What did you do before joining this organization [ <i>1: student; 2: worker not related to art; 3: work related to art; 4: unemployed]</i>	PRIOR_WORK
13		
14	I use to report to [ <i>1-3; 1: art director; 2: head of the organization; 3: nobody]</i>	REPORT
15		
16	I interact with my co-workers [ <i>1-3; 1: informally; 2: formal meetings; 3: mails]</i>	INTERACT
17		
18	I am encouraged by my colleagues in pursuing my work [ <i>1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]</i>	ENC
19		
20	<b>Section 4: Cultural/artistic issues</b>	
21	My primary motivation when it comes to working is [ <i>1-5; 1: money; 2: personal goals; 3: helping the community &amp;/or the territory; 4: competition; 5: other]</i>	MOTIVATION
22		
23	The advantage(s) of being part of this organization is (are) [up to 2 choices] [ <i>1-4; 1: Possibility of education/training; 2: Higher chances of having a broader audience; 3: Higher future employability; 4: Being part of an artistic movement employability]</i>	ADV
24		
25		
26		
27	The disadvantage(s) of being part of this organization is (are) [up to 2 choices] [ <i>1-3; 1: Distance from the family and/or hometown; 2: Risk of being copied; 3: Presence of constraints in the creativity process; 4: no disadvantages]</i>	DISADV
28		
29		
30	My cultural background affects my current work [ <i>1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]</i>	CULT_BACK
31		
32	<b>Section 5: Knowledge sharing process</b>	
33	The working environment supports knowledge sharing [ <i>Scale 1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]</i>	ENV
34		
35	Who is more willing to share information? [ <i>1-3; 1: juniors; 2: experienced workers; 3: no difference]</i>	INFO_SHARE
36		
37		
38	The tools and spaces available in my working environment facilitate the transfer of information among workers [ <i>1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]</i>	TOOLS_SPACE
39		
40	<b>Section 6: Community aspects</b>	
41	I feel part of the community in which I work [ <i>1-5; 1: strongly disagree; 5: strongly agree]</i>	COMM
42		
43	I feel judged by my colleagues for the work I perform [ <i>1- 5; 1: always; 5: never]</i>	JUDGE
44		
45	I know well my colleagues [ <i>1- 5; 1: not at all; 5: really well]</i>	COLL
46		
47	I am afraid that someone could steal my ideas [ <i>1- 5; 1: not at all; 5: strongly]</i>	IDEA
48	<b>Section 7: Personal thoughts of knowledge sharing</b>	
49	I share pieces of information concerning my work with my colleagues [ <i>1-4; 1: always; 2: sometimes; 3: rarely; 4: never]</i>	INFO_SHARE 2
50		
51	I usually perform my work [ <i>1-3; 1: in-group; 2: alone; 3: both]</i>	INGROUP_A LONE
52		
53	I am willing to listen when people of my organization talk about things I don't like or believe in [ <i>1- 5; 1: not at all; 5: completely]</i>	LISTEN
54		
55	When faced with a problem, I am most likely to [ <i>1-4; 1: Use a solution that worked in the past; 2: ask a colleague for help; 3: try and think up a new solution; 4: work on several possible solutions].</i>	PROBL
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
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

I often organize (or write down) my ideas/projects [1-5; 1: <i>strongly disagree</i> ; 5: <i>strongly agree</i> ]	PROJ_ORG
I tend to follow a routine at work [1-5; 1: <i>strongly disagree</i> ; 5: <i>strongly agree</i> ]	ROUTINE
I like working with other people [1- 5; 1: <i>not at all</i> ; 5: <i>really well</i> ]	WORK_OT_P EOPLE

Journal of Intellectual Capital

## Appendix 2 – General interview guide

---

1. Do you know the “The Artist/Project Founder” (hereafter A/PF)?
2. Do you consider him as an Artist?
3. How did the A/PF initiate with Art?
4. Would you categorise the A/PF in a category of art? Painter, sculptor or what else?
5. Do you find some peculiar traits that distinguish the A/PF from other artists of the same period? (E.g. Enthusiasm, love for the African traditions, use of multiple art techniques, other).
6. Where does the A/PF take inspiration?
7. What kind of Art education and training did the A/PF had?
8. Which influence did the family had on the A/PF expression?
9. Which is the relation between a contemporaneous artist, as the A/PF, and other artists of the past?
10. How did you get to know the works of the A/PF?
11. What do you most appreciate of the A/PF’s art works?
12. Why do you buy the A/PF’s works? (E.g. investment, I like them, both, etc.).
13. Have you ever bought and resell the A/PF’s artwork?
14. Do you know the A/PF’s love for Africa?
15. Why did the A/PF choose Kenya?
16. Do African artists share their knowledge?
17. Are there, according to you, some peculiarities in the process of knowledge sharing and in the process of art creation in Kenya?
18. Can you describe how do the activities are carried out in the A/PFs’ laboratories and spaces in Kenya?
19. Which peculiarities do you find in the A/PF’s organization and in his human resources management?
20. How is the intellectual capital/art creation valorised?
21. Do you think that the A/PF’s work benefits from the African traditions?
22. How do you think Kenya contributes to the work of the A/PF? And/Or viceversa?
23. Which are according to you the values, messages and ideals that the A/PF spreads through his works?
24. Do you know the “White Elephant Project”?
25. Have you ever heard about the A/PF’s desire to create a School of Art in Kenya?
26. Do you think that Kenya might benefit from the above desire? If yes, in which sense? What type of benefits?
27. Which is the relation between the A/PF and African artists?
28. Do you know how the work is organized at the A/PF's School of art (organization) in Kenya? If yes, could you please describe it to us.
29. What are the main differences between the A/PF's art creations and the other artists’ creations you buy?

---

*Questions were adapted according to the interviewee.*

---