



ISIR Journal of Multidisciplinary (ISIRJM)

ISSN: 3049-3080 (Online)

Frequency: Bimonthly

Published By ISIR Publisher

Journal Homepage Link- <https://isirpublisher.com/isirjm/>



Organizational Innovativeness and Human Capital: Managing Human Resources, Knowledge and Entrepreneurship in a Value-Based Economy

By

Wojciech Slomski



Article History

Received: 25/04/2026

Accepted: 07/05/2026

Published: 09/05/2026

Vol – 2 Issue – 3

PP: -25-33

Abstract

This article analyses organizational innovativeness and human capital as central determinants of entrepreneurship in a value-based economy. Its main thesis is that innovation cannot be reduced to technology, product development or market disruption. Rather, organizational innovativeness emerges from the interaction between human capital, knowledge management, human resource management, entrepreneurial agency, ethical responsibility, governance, family and psychosocial determinants, socioeconomic conditions and digital communication. In a value-based economy, the decisive question is not only how organizations innovate, but also what kind of value they create, for whom, and under what ethical and institutional conditions.

The article integrates classical and contemporary theories of entrepreneurship, knowledge management, human resource management, innovation and governance with the empirical and theoretical works of Marcin W. Staniewski and his co-authors. Particular attention is given to human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness, knowledge management as a transition from concept to practice, ethical aspects of entrepreneurship, socioeconomic factors influencing student entrepreneurship, family communication and entrepreneurial self-efficacy, family determinants of entrepreneurial success through self-esteem and achievement motivation, corruption as an institutional barrier, governance and sustainable growth, and digital consumer value creation through WhatsApp use.

The first part discusses human capital as a strategic and ethical resource in the value-based economy. The second part analyses human resource management as a foundation of organizational innovativeness. The third part examines knowledge management as the cognitive infrastructure of innovation. The fourth part interprets entrepreneurship as responsible value creation. The fifth part discusses family, psychosocial and socioeconomic determinants of entrepreneurial agency. The sixth part analyses governance, corruption and sustainable growth. The seventh part examines digital communication and consumer value creation. The article concludes that organizational innovativeness requires an integrated model in which human capital, knowledge, entrepreneurship, ethics and governance jointly shape sustainable value creation.

Keywords: *organizational innovativeness; human capital; human resource management; knowledge management; entrepreneurship; value-based economy; ethics; governance; sustainable growth; consumer value creation.*

Introduction

The contemporary economy is increasingly defined by knowledge, innovation, human capital and value creation. Organizations compete not only through physical assets, financial resources or technological equipment, but through people, learning, creativity, communication, ethical credibility

and the capacity to transform knowledge into sustainable value. In such an environment, organizational innovativeness becomes one of the central conditions of entrepreneurship and long-term development. Yet innovation cannot be understood only as technological novelty. It is also a human, organizational, ethical and institutional process.



Classical entrepreneurship and innovation theories provide an important foundation for this argument. Schumpeter interpreted entrepreneurship as the introduction of new combinations and as a force of creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker understood innovation and entrepreneurship as disciplined practices that can be learned, organized and managed (Drucker, 1985). Kirzner emphasized entrepreneurial alertness to opportunity, while Knight connected entrepreneurship with uncertainty and risk-bearing (Knight, 1921; Kirzner, 1973). These theories remain indispensable, but contemporary organizations require a broader model in which entrepreneurship is connected with human capital, knowledge management, ethical responsibility and governance.

Human capital is central to this broader model. Innovation is generated by people: their knowledge, skills, creativity, motivation, experience and capacity for cooperation. Staniewski's article on human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness is especially important in this respect because it explicitly connects HRM with the innovative capacity of organizations (Staniewski, 2011). Employees are not merely labour inputs or administrative categories. They are carriers of tacit knowledge, practical experience and creative potential. Organizational innovativeness depends on how this potential is recognized, developed and mobilized.

Knowledge management is the second central dimension. Staniewski's article *Zarządzanie wiedzą: od koncepcji do praktyki działania* emphasizes that knowledge management must move from theoretical concept to practical organizational action (Staniewski, 2002). In a value-based economy, knowledge becomes valuable only when it is translated into decisions, routines, innovation and responsible value creation. The organization must therefore become not only a structure of production, but also a system of learning and interpretation.

The value-based economy also requires ethical entrepreneurship. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects because entrepreneurial action affects persons, communities and institutions (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). This means that value cannot be reduced to profit. Economic value must be interpreted together with social, relational, ethical and institutional value. An innovative organization that destroys trust, exploits employees or manipulates consumers cannot be considered genuinely successful in a value-based economy.

Governance provides the institutional framework for such responsible innovation. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski connect sustainable growth with innovation, management and governance, indicating that development requires institutional coordination of economic creativity (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Abu and Staniewski's empirical investigation of corruption and domestic savings in Nigeria shows the opposite side of this relationship: corruption weakens institutional trust and affects development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Governance and anti-corruption

are therefore necessary for the sustainable use of human capital and knowledge.

Entrepreneurial agency is also shaped by family and social conditions. Staniewski and Szopiński show that socioeconomic factors influence the entrepreneurship of Polish students, demonstrating that entrepreneurial readiness is socially embedded (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy, while family determinants influence success through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2025; Staniewski et al., 2024). Thus, human capital begins before the organization. It is formed in families, schools, universities and social environments.

Finally, contemporary value creation increasingly occurs through digital communication. Cruz-Cárdenas, Guadalupe-Lanas, Zabelina, Palacio-Fierro, Velín-Fárez and Staniewski show that WhatsApp use enables consumers to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). This finding expands the idea of the value-based economy: value is not only produced internally by firms; it is co-created through communication, networks and consumer participation.

The aim of this article is to analyse organizational innovativeness and human capital through the management of human resources, knowledge and entrepreneurship in a value-based economy. The article argues that sustainable organizational innovativeness requires the integration of HRM, knowledge management, entrepreneurial agency, ethics, governance and communicative value creation.

Human Capital as a Strategic and Ethical Resource

Human capital is one of the most important resources of the contemporary organization. It includes knowledge, skills, creativity, experience, motivation, moral judgement, communicative competence and the ability to learn. In a value-based economy, human capital is not merely an instrument of productivity. It is the living source of innovation, organizational learning and responsible value creation.

The resource-based view of the firm provides a useful theoretical foundation for this argument. Barney argues that sustainable competitive advantage depends on resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Barney, 1991). Human capital often possesses precisely these features. Technologies can be copied, procedures can be imitated and products can be replaced, but the unique combination of knowledge, experience, trust and creativity embodied in people is much more difficult to reproduce. Penrose's theory of firm growth also emphasizes the role of internal resources and managerial knowledge in organizational development (Penrose, 1959).

Staniewski's analysis of human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness confirms this strategic view of

people (Staniewski, 2011). Innovativeness depends on employees who are able to think creatively, interpret problems, share knowledge and participate in organizational change. Human resources are therefore not only an administrative function but a central source of innovation. This perspective corresponds to Pfeffer's argument that competitive advantage can be built through people and to Huselid's findings that HRM practices influence productivity, turnover and performance (Pfeffer, 1994; Huselid, 1995).

However, human capital is not only strategic; it is also ethical. If employees are sources of knowledge and innovation, they must not be treated merely as tools of performance. Ethical management requires respect for persons, development of talents, fair treatment, participation and recognition of human dignity. This point connects HRM with the ethical aspects of entrepreneurship analysed by Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Organizations create value through people, but they must not reduce people to value-generating instruments.

The ethical interpretation of human capital is especially important in a value-based economy. Value is not limited to shareholder return or financial performance. It includes social value, relational value, trust, learning, sustainability and institutional legitimacy. Human capital contributes to all these forms of value. Employees create knowledge, maintain relationships, communicate with customers, implement innovations and embody organizational values.

Human capital also has a formative dimension. It is shaped before individuals enter organizations. Family communication, socioeconomic background, education, self-esteem, achievement motivation and entrepreneurial self-efficacy all influence how people participate in economic life. Staniewski and Szopiński show that socioeconomic factors influence student entrepreneurship (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013), while Staniewski et al. show that family communication and family determinants shape entrepreneurial success through self-efficacy, self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2025; Staniewski et al., 2024). These studies demonstrate that human capital is socially and psychologically formed.

Thus, human capital should be understood as both an organizational resource and a human reality. It is strategic because it supports innovation and competitiveness. It is ethical because it concerns persons. It is social because it is formed in families and institutions. It is developmental because it grows through learning. Organizational innovativeness begins with this complex understanding of human capital.

Human Resource Management as a Foundation of Organizational Innovativeness

Human resource management is one of the central mechanisms through which human capital becomes organizational innovativeness. Innovation does not arise automatically from the presence of talented people. It requires organizational practices that identify, develop, motivate and

coordinate human capabilities. HRM therefore functions as a bridge between individual potential and collective innovation.

Staniewski's article on human resource management in the aspect of innovativeness provides the key foundation for this section (Staniewski, 2011). His analysis shows that organizational innovativeness depends on the way human resources are managed. Employees must be supported in learning, encouraged to participate, motivated to share knowledge and enabled to contribute ideas. Innovativeness is not simply a technical output; it is the result of human and organizational processes.

This perspective corresponds to classical and contemporary HRM literature. Pfeffer argues that firms can build competitive advantage through people (Pfeffer, 1994). Huselid demonstrates that HRM practices influence turnover, productivity and corporate financial performance (Huselid, 1995). Becker, Huselid and Ulrich show that human resource systems must be linked with strategy and performance measurement (Becker, Huselid and Ulrich, 2001). Schuler and Jackson emphasize the need to align HRM practices with competitive strategies (Schuler and Jackson, 1987). Together, these works support the idea that HRM is strategic.

In innovation-oriented organizations, HRM must encourage creativity, autonomy and cooperation. Recruitment should identify not only technical competence but also learning capacity and openness to change. Training should develop both knowledge and problem-solving ability. Performance systems should reward not only individual output but also collaboration and innovation. Leadership should create psychological safety, allowing employees to express ideas and learn from failure.

Staniewski's focus on innovativeness is important because it prevents HRM from being reduced to administration (Staniewski, 2011). HRM is not only about contracts, payroll or compliance. It is about creating a human environment in which innovation can emerge. Employees must be treated as co-creators of organizational value.

Organizational learning theory deepens this argument. Senge's concept of the learning organization emphasizes systems thinking, shared vision, team learning and personal mastery (Senge, 1990). Brown and Duguid show that learning often takes place through communities of practice, while Wenger interprets communities of practice as spaces of learning, meaning and identity (Brown and Duguid, 1991; Wenger, 1998). These theories indicate that HRM should support not only individual training but also social learning.

Innovation theory confirms the same point. Abernathy and Clark show that innovation can reshape existing competencies, while Henderson and Clark demonstrate that architectural innovation may challenge organizations even when core technologies remain familiar (Abernathy and Clark, 1985; Henderson and Clark, 1990). Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation shows that firms may fail because they cannot interpret change or reorganize capabilities (Christensen, 1997). These theories show that

innovation depends on people's ability to learn, unlearn and adapt.

In a value-based economy, HRM must also be ethical. The management of human resources cannot serve innovation at the cost of human dignity. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's analysis of ethical entrepreneurship reminds us that economic practices must be evaluated morally (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). HRM must therefore support innovation and responsibility simultaneously.

Thus, human resource management is a foundation of organizational innovativeness because it transforms human capital into collective creativity, learning and responsible value creation.

Knowledge Management as the Cognitive Infrastructure of Innovation

Knowledge management provides the cognitive infrastructure of organizational innovativeness. Human capital becomes innovative when knowledge is created, shared, interpreted and applied. Without knowledge management, organizations may possess talented employees but fail to transform their experience into systematic learning and innovation.

Staniewski's article *Zarządzanie wiedzą: od koncepcji do praktyki działania* is central to this argument because it emphasizes the transition from knowledge-management concept to organizational practice (Staniewski, 2002). Knowledge management is not simply a theoretical discourse or a technological system. It is a practical process through which knowledge becomes action. In innovative organizations, knowledge must move from individual experience to collective capability.

Davenport and Prusak define knowledge as a mixture of experience, values, contextual information and expert insight (Davenport and Prusak, 1998). This definition is important because it shows that knowledge is richer than data. In organizations, knowledge includes practical judgement, tacit understanding and interpretive competence. Alavi and Leidner similarly show that knowledge management systems support knowledge processes but cannot replace human interpretation (Alavi and Leidner, 2001).

Nonaka and Takeuchi's theory of the knowledge-creating company provides a key framework. They argue that organizational knowledge develops through the interaction between tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). Tacit knowledge is embodied in experience and difficult to formalize; explicit knowledge can be codified and transmitted. Organizational innovativeness depends on the ability to convert tacit insights into explicit knowledge and to transform explicit knowledge into new tacit competence.

Staniewski's practical understanding of knowledge management can be interpreted as an organizational implementation of this logic (Staniewski, 2002). Knowledge must be captured, shared and used. It must not remain isolated in individuals. Entrepreneurial firms in particular must avoid excessive dependence on the founder's tacit knowledge.

Sustainable innovation requires organizational memory, communication channels and learning routines.

Cohen and Levinthal's concept of absorptive capacity is also essential. Organizations can recognize and use external knowledge only when they possess relevant prior knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). In a value-based economy, firms must absorb knowledge from customers, technologies, markets, social expectations and sustainability challenges. Absorptive capacity allows organizations to interpret this knowledge and transform it into innovation.

Argote, McEvily and Reagans emphasize knowledge transfer, retention and integration as central organizational processes (Argote, McEvily and Reagans, 2003). These processes are directly related to innovativeness. Knowledge that cannot be transferred remains local. Knowledge that cannot be retained disappears. Knowledge that cannot be integrated fails to become strategic capability. Knowledge management therefore supports long-term innovation.

Knowledge management also links innovation with entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs must interpret opportunities, learn from customers and adapt to changing environments. Schumpeter's entrepreneur introduces new combinations, but such combinations require knowledge (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker's disciplined innovation requires systematic observation and learning (Drucker, 1985). Thus, innovation is knowledge in action.

In a value-based economy, knowledge management must also be ethical. Knowledge can be used to create value, but also to manipulate consumers or exploit employees. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's ethical approach to entrepreneurship indicates that the use of knowledge must be evaluated in relation to responsibility (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Knowledge management becomes sustainable only when oriented toward legitimate value creation.

Therefore, knowledge management is the cognitive infrastructure of organizational innovativeness. It connects human capital with learning, entrepreneurship with interpretation, and innovation with responsible action.

Entrepreneurship in a Value-Based Economy

Entrepreneurship in a value-based economy must be understood as responsible value creation. It is not merely the creation of firms, the pursuit of profit or the identification of market opportunities. It is the process through which knowledge, human capital, innovation and ethical responsibility are combined to create economic, social, relational and institutional value.

Classical theories of entrepreneurship emphasize different aspects of this process. Schumpeter highlights innovation and new combinations (Schumpeter, 1934). Drucker emphasizes disciplined practice and systematic innovation (Drucker, 1985). Kirzner focuses on alertness to opportunity (Kirzner, 1973). Knight emphasizes uncertainty and risk (Knight, 1921). In a value-based economy, these aspects remain

important, but they must be interpreted within a broader ethical and institutional framework.

Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk argue that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects because entrepreneurial action affects persons and social relations (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). This means that entrepreneurship cannot be separated from responsibility. The question is not only whether the entrepreneur creates value, but whether that value is legitimate, sustainable and humanly meaningful. Profit is necessary but insufficient.

The value-based economy also requires attention to social and relational value. Cruz-Cárdenas et al. show that WhatsApp use enables consumers to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). This finding expands the concept of value beyond economic exchange. Consumers participate in value creation through communication, community and emotional support. Entrepreneurs must therefore understand value as co-created rather than simply delivered.

Entrepreneurship also depends on socioeconomic conditions. Staniewski and Szopiński show that socioeconomic factors influence the entrepreneurship of Polish students (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This indicates that entrepreneurial agency is not equally available to all individuals. A value-based economy must therefore consider inclusion, education and fair access to entrepreneurial opportunities. If entrepreneurship is to create social value, it must not be limited to those with privileged access to resources.

Family and psychosocial determinants are also central. Staniewski et al. show that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy, while family determinants influence success through self-esteem and achievement motivation (Staniewski et al., 2025; Staniewski et al., 2024). These findings demonstrate that entrepreneurship is formed through relationships before it becomes economic action. A value-based economy must therefore value the social formation of human agency.

Knowledge management and HRM provide the organizational conditions for entrepreneurial value creation. Staniewski's works on knowledge management and HRM show that knowledge and people are central to innovation (Staniewski, 2002; Staniewski, 2011). Entrepreneurial organizations must learn, innovate and manage human capital responsibly. Without these capacities, entrepreneurship remains fragile.

Governance provides the institutional foundation. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski argue that sustainable growth requires innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Governance ensures that entrepreneurship contributes to sustainable value rather than short-term extraction. Abu and Staniewski's study of corruption shows that corruption weakens development conditions by damaging trust and incentives (Abu and Staniewski, 2022).

Thus, entrepreneurship in a value-based economy is an integrated practice. It requires human capital, knowledge, innovation, ethics, governance and communication. It creates value not only for owners but for stakeholders, institutions and society.

Family, Psychosocial and Socioeconomic Formation of Human Capital

Human capital does not begin inside organizations. It is formed through family communication, education, socioeconomic conditions and psychological development. If organizational innovativeness depends on human capital, then the social formation of human capital must be part of the analysis.

Staniewski and Szopiński's study on Polish students shows that socioeconomic factors influence entrepreneurial attitudes (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). This is important because students represent future human capital. Their entrepreneurial readiness is shaped by family background, education, labour-market expectations and perceived feasibility of entrepreneurship. Organizations later receive individuals whose agency has already been socially formed.

Family communication is also central. Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family communication influences entrepreneurial success through entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Staniewski et al., 2025). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy is a belief in one's capacity to perform entrepreneurial tasks. It is crucial not only for starting firms but also for participating in innovative organizations. Employees with stronger self-efficacy may be more willing to propose ideas, solve problems and take initiative.

The related study on family determinants of entrepreneurial success shows that self-esteem and achievement motivation mediate the relationship between family factors and entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2024). These variables are also important for organizational innovativeness. Self-esteem supports resilience and openness to feedback; achievement motivation directs effort toward goals. Innovative organizations need people who are confident enough to experiment and motivated enough to persist.

McClelland's theory of achievement motivation helps interpret this relationship. Achievement-oriented individuals seek challenging tasks, take responsibility and value feedback (McClelland, 1961). Such traits are valuable for entrepreneurship and innovation. However, Staniewski et al. add that achievement motivation is shaped through family and social determinants (Staniewski et al., 2024). Human capital is therefore not simply an individual possession; it is socially cultivated.

Socioeconomic inequality can affect the development of human capital. Individuals from supportive and resource-rich environments may have greater access to education, networks and confidence-building experiences. Those from less privileged backgrounds may possess talent but lack opportunities. Staniewski and Szopiński's findings therefore imply that entrepreneurship and innovation policy must

address social access to human-capital formation (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013).

This has implications for HRM. Organizations should not assume that human capital is fully formed before employment. They must develop it through training, mentoring, participation and ethical leadership. Staniewski's HRM perspective shows that innovativeness depends on how organizations manage and develop people (Staniewski, 2011). HRM becomes a continuation of social formation.

Thus, human capital is formed across levels: family, education, society and organization. A value-based economy must support all these levels if it seeks sustainable innovativeness.

Governance, Corruption and Institutional Conditions of Value-Based Innovation

Organizational innovativeness and human capital require institutional support. Knowledge, creativity and entrepreneurship flourish where governance is transparent, rules are predictable and institutions are trustworthy. Conversely, corruption weakens the incentives to invest in people, knowledge and innovation.

Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski emphasize that sustainable growth requires innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). This triad is crucial for a value-based economy. Innovation creates new possibilities, management organizes human and knowledge resources, and governance provides legitimacy and accountability. Without governance, innovation may become opportunistic or socially harmful.

Governance theory supports this claim. Kooiman understands governance as interaction between public and private actors (Kooiman, 1993). Rhodes describes governance beyond traditional government, while Stoker interprets governance as collective action structured by institutions (Rhodes, 1996; Stoker, 1998). Ostrom shows that rules, trust and participation are essential for governing shared resources (Ostrom, 1990). These perspectives indicate that economic value creation depends on institutional coordination.

Corruption undermines such coordination. Abu and Staniewski's empirical study of corruption and domestic savings in Nigeria shows that corruption affects savings and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). This finding is relevant for organizational innovativeness because innovation requires long-term investment. Firms invest in people, knowledge systems and research when they trust the future. Corruption weakens that trust.

Corruption also changes the meaning of competitive advantage. In a healthy value-based economy, advantage should result from knowledge, human capital, innovation and ethical reputation. In corrupt environments, advantage may depend on informal access or manipulation. This discourages investment in real capabilities. Abu and Staniewski's findings

therefore support the conclusion that corruption is a barrier to value-based innovation (Abu and Staniewski, 2022).

Baumol's distinction between productive, unproductive and destructive entrepreneurship again becomes relevant (Baumol, 1990). Good governance channels entrepreneurship toward productive innovation. Corruption redirects it toward rent-seeking. Human capital may still exist, but it may be used for unproductive strategies if institutions reward them. Governance therefore shapes not only the quantity but also the quality of entrepreneurship.

Governance also supports ethical HRM and knowledge management. Organizations are more likely to invest in employees and knowledge when rules protect fair competition. Ethical entrepreneurship, as described by Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, requires institutional contexts that do not punish honesty (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Governance aligns ethical action with sustainable performance.

Sustainable development theory further strengthens this argument. The World Commission on Environment and Development defines sustainable development in terms of responsibility toward future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Elkington's triple bottom line links business performance with people, planet and profit (Elkington, 1997). Hart and Milstein show that firms can create sustainable value through social and environmental strategy (Hart and Milstein, 2003). Governance is necessary to align private innovation with these broader values.

Thus, governance and anti-corruption are institutional conditions of value-based innovation. Without them, human capital and knowledge may be underused, misdirected or exploited.

Digital Communication and Consumer Value Creation in the Value-Based Economy

The value-based economy is increasingly communicative and digital. Consumers are no longer only passive recipients of products and services. They participate in value creation through digital communication, networks, communities and everyday practices. This transformation changes the meaning of organizational innovativeness and entrepreneurship.

Cruz-Cárdenas, Guadalupe-Lanas, Zabelina, Palacio-Fierro, Velín-Fárez and Staniewski show that WhatsApp use enables consumers to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). This finding is crucial because it shows that value is not limited to economic transaction. Digital communication creates value by supporting relationships, coordination, emotional connection and social interaction.

For organizations, this means that innovation must be communicative. Firms must understand how consumers use technologies, how they create meaning and how they participate in value creation. Digital platforms allow

organizations to interact with consumers, receive feedback, build communities and co-create value. Organizational innovativeness therefore requires communicative competence as well as technological capability.

Rogers's diffusion of innovations theory helps explain this process. Innovations spread through communication channels and social systems (Rogers, 1962). von Hippel's theory of user innovation shows that users often contribute to innovation by adapting products and practices to their needs (von Hippel, 1988). Digital communication intensifies these processes by making interaction faster, more relational and more visible.

Technology acceptance theory also matters. Davis argues that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use influence technology adoption (Davis, 1989). Organizations that seek digital innovation must therefore understand user perception. Brynjolfsson and Hitt show that information technology contributes to performance when combined with organizational transformation (Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000). Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee similarly argue that digital transformation requires leadership and strategic integration (Westerman, Bonnet and McAfee, 2014).

Cruz-Cárdenas et al.'s study also has ethical implications (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). If consumers create relational and emotional value through digital platforms, organizations must respect the trust embedded in these interactions. Digital entrepreneurship can easily become manipulative if it exploits attention, emotions or personal data. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk's analysis of ethical entrepreneurship therefore applies directly to digital value creation (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015).

Digital communication also depends on human capital. Employees must interpret consumer feedback, manage online relationships and transform digital interaction into knowledge. This connects digital value creation with knowledge management and HRM. Staniewski's works show that knowledge must become practice and that people are central to innovation (Staniewski, 2002; Staniewski, 2011). Digital innovation therefore requires trained, ethical and communicatively competent human capital.

Thus, digital communication expands the value-based economy by showing that value is co-created. Organizational innovativeness must include not only new technologies but also new forms of relational, ethical and communicative value.

Integrated Model of Organizational Innovativeness in a Value-Based Economy

The analyses above allow for an integrated model of organizational innovativeness in a value-based economy. This model includes eight interconnected dimensions.

First, human capital is the foundation of innovation. Employees carry knowledge, creativity, experience and ethical judgement. Staniewski's analysis of HRM and

innovativeness shows that people are central to organizational innovation (Staniewski, 2011).

Second, knowledge management provides the cognitive infrastructure. Staniewski's work on knowledge management shows that knowledge must move from concept to practice (Staniewski, 2002). Organizations must create systems for learning, interpretation and application.

Third, entrepreneurship transforms knowledge and human capital into value. Classical entrepreneurship theory explains innovation, opportunity and risk, but in a value-based economy entrepreneurship must be interpreted as responsible value creation.

Fourth, ethics provides normative direction. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk show that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects because it affects people and institutions (Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk, 2015). Innovation must therefore be evaluated morally.

Fifth, governance provides institutional legitimacy. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski show that sustainable growth requires innovation, management and governance (Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski, 2022). Governance aligns innovation with social responsibility.

Sixth, anti-corruption protects trust. Abu and Staniewski show that corruption affects domestic savings and weakens development conditions (Abu and Staniewski, 2022). Corruption undermines investment in knowledge, people and innovation.

Seventh, family and socioeconomic determinants shape entrepreneurial human capital. Staniewski and Szopiński show that socioeconomic factors influence student entrepreneurship (Staniewski and Szopiński, 2013). Staniewski et al. show that family communication, self-efficacy, self-esteem and achievement motivation shape entrepreneurial success (Staniewski et al., 2025; Staniewski et al., 2024).

Eighth, digital communication expands value creation. Cruz-Cárdenas et al. show that WhatsApp enables consumers to create relational, emotional, functional and social value (Cruz-Cárdenas et al., 2019). Organizations must therefore innovate communicatively as well as technologically.

This model shows that organizational innovativeness is not a single organizational capability. It is a systemic process connecting people, knowledge, entrepreneurship, ethics, governance and communication. In a value-based economy, innovation is successful only when it creates sustainable and legitimate value.

Conclusion

Organizational innovativeness in a value-based economy depends on the integration of human capital, human resource management, knowledge management, entrepreneurship, ethics, governance and digital communication. Innovation is not only technological novelty. It is a human and

organizational process through which knowledge becomes responsible value.

This article has argued that human capital is both a strategic and ethical resource. Staniewski's work on HRM and innovativeness shows that employees are central to innovation. His work on knowledge management shows that knowledge must be translated into practice. Staniewski, Słomski and Awruk demonstrate that entrepreneurship has ethical aspects. Alonso Dos Santos, Huertas González-Serrano and Staniewski show that sustainable growth requires innovation, management and governance. Abu and Staniewski show that corruption weakens development conditions. Staniewski and Szopiński show that entrepreneurship is shaped by socioeconomic factors. Staniewski, Awruk, Leonardi and Słomski show that family communication, self-efficacy, self-esteem and achievement motivation shape entrepreneurial success. Cruz-Cárdenas et al. show that digital communication creates new forms of consumer value.

The final conclusion is that the value-based economy requires organizations that are innovative because they are human-centred, knowledge-based, ethically responsible and institutionally governed. Human capital provides creativity. HRM activates it. Knowledge management organizes it. Entrepreneurship directs it toward opportunity. Ethics gives it meaning. Governance protects it. Digital communication expands it. Sustainable value emerges only when all these dimensions are integrated.

Bibliography

1. Abernathy, W. J., & Clark, K. B. (1985). Innovation: Mapping the winds of creative destruction. *Research Policy*, 14(1), 3–22.
2. Abu, N., & Staniewski, M. W. (2022). An empirical investigation of the effect of corruption on domestic savings in Nigeria. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 35(1), 4092–4112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.2010113>
3. Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues. *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107–136.
4. Alonso Dos Santos, M., Huertas González-Serrano, M., & Staniewski, M. W. (2022). Analytical editorial: Ensuring the future of our world: Innovation, management and governance for sustainable growth. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 35(2), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARLA-07-2022-368>
5. Argote, L., McEvily, B., & Reagans, R. (2003). Managing knowledge in organizations: An integrative framework and review of emerging themes. *Management Science*, 49(4), 571–582.
6. Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
7. Baumol, W. J. (1990). Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 893–921.
8. Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., & Ulrich, D. (2001). *The HR scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
9. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (1991). Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 40–57.
10. Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2000). *The social life of information*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
11. Brynjolfsson, E., & Hitt, L. M. (2000). Beyond computation: Information technology, organizational transformation and business performance. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(4), 23–48.
12. Casson, M. (1982). *The entrepreneur: An economic theory*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
13. Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma: When new technologies cause great firms to fail*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
14. Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152.
15. Cruz-Cárdenas, J., Guadalupe-Lanas, J., Zabelina, E., Palacio-Fierro, A., Velín-Fárez, M., & Staniewski, M. W. (2019). Consumer value creation through WhatsApp use: A qualitative multimethod approach in a Latin American scenario. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 32(4), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ARLA-02-2019-0044>
16. Davenport, T. H., & Prusak, L. (1998). *Working knowledge: How organizations manage what they know*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
17. Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
18. Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
19. Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Oxford: Capstone.
20. Hart, S. L., & Milstein, M. B. (2003). Creating sustainable value. *Academy of Management Executive*, 17(2), 56–67.
21. Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 9–30.
22. Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover,

- productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635–672.
23. Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 24. Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
 25. Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: New government-society interactions*. London: Sage.
 26. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
 27. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 28. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 29. Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 30. Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
 31. Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(4), 97–118.
 32. Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667.
 33. Rogers, E. M. (1962). *Diffusion of innovations*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
 34. Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), 207–219.
 35. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Translated by Redvers Opie. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 36. Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
 37. Staniewski, M. (2002). Zarządzanie wiedzą: Od koncepcji do praktyki działania. *Organizacja i Kierowanie*, 3(109), 35–48.
 38. Staniewski, M. W. (2011). Management of human resources in the aspect of innovativeness. *Contemporary Economics*, 5(1), 84–91. <https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.7>
 39. Staniewski, M. W., & Szopiński, T. (2013). Influence of socioeconomic factors on the entrepreneurship of Polish students. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 12(3/30), 152–167.
 40. Staniewski, M. W., Słomski, W., & Awruk, K. (2015). Ethical aspects of entrepreneurship. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 26(1), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2015.26.1.5>
 41. Staniewski, M. W., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G., & Słomski, W. (2024). Family determinants of entrepreneurial success: The mediational role of self-esteem and achievement motivation. *Journal of Business Research*, 171, 114383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114383>
 42. Staniewski, M. W., Awruk, K., Leonardi, G., & Słomski, W. (2025). Family communication and entrepreneurial success: The mediating role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 10(1), 100635. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100635>
 43. Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28.
 44. von Hippel, E. (1988). *The sources of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 45. Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 46. Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
 47. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.