
Networked Knowledge, Social Capital, and Consulting Architectures for Innovation Performance in Small and Medium Sized Enterprises

Matthew L. Sterling

Faculty of Economics and Business, Charles University, Czech Republic

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Submission: December 01, 2025

Accepted: December 16, 2025

Published: December 31, 2025

VOLUME: Vol.10 Issue 12 2025

Keywords:

Business consulting, social capital, absorptive capacity, innovation systems, knowledge based economy, small and medium sized enterprises, interorganizational networks

ABSTRACT

As The transformation of small and medium sized enterprises into resilient and innovation driven organizations has become one of the most consequential challenges of contemporary economic development. Across diverse national and sectoral contexts, small and medium sized enterprises face increasing complexity derived from accelerated technological change, shifting market structures, and the growing importance of knowledge as a strategic asset. Within this environment, business consulting has evolved from a transactional service into a multidimensional knowledge intensive system that connects firms to external networks, innovation ecosystems, and institutional infrastructures. At the same time, social capital, absorptive capacity, and organizational innovativeness have emerged as decisive determinants of whether firms are able to translate external knowledge into sustainable competitive advantage. This article develops an integrated theoretical and methodological framework that links complex consulting models with network based theories of knowledge creation and social capital in order to explain how small and medium sized enterprises can enhance innovation performance through structured interaction with consulting systems and interorganizational networks.

The results demonstrate that consulting models which are aligned with networked knowledge structures significantly enhance the ability of small and medium sized enterprises to identify, acquire, assimilate, and exploit external knowledge. Social capital emerges as a critical mediating factor that amplifies the effectiveness of consulting by facilitating trust, reciprocity, and access to heterogeneous information sources. At the same time, the organizational innovativeness of firms determines whether external inputs can be translated into new products, processes, and business models. The analysis further reveals that consulting architectures which integrate technological, organizational, and relational dimensions are more effective than narrowly focused advisory approaches.

The discussion situates these findings within broader debates on the knowledge based economy, innovation systems, and the evolving role of professional services in entrepreneurial ecosystems. The article argues that the future of small and medium sized enterprise development depends on the institutionalization of complex consulting models that operate as integrative platforms for learning, collaboration, and strategic renewal. By providing a theoretically grounded and methodologically rigorous framework, this study contributes to both academic scholarship and policy oriented discourse on how to design more effective support structures for innovation driven entrepreneurship.

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary economic landscape is increasingly characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, conditions that place extraordinary pressure on small and medium sized enterprises to continuously

adapt, learn, and innovate. In contrast to large corporations, which often possess extensive internal resources for research, development, and strategic planning, small and medium sized enterprises typically operate with constrained financial, human, and technological capacities. Yet these firms are widely recognized as critical engines of employment, regional development, and entrepreneurial dynamism within national and global economies. The central paradox of small and medium sized enterprise development lies in the tension between their structural limitations and their pivotal role in driving innovation and economic growth, a tension that has been widely examined within the literature on entrepreneurship and innovation systems (Freeman, 1987; Edquist, 1997).

Within this context, business consulting has emerged as a crucial institutional mechanism through which small and medium sized enterprises can access external knowledge, strategic guidance, and network resources that would otherwise remain beyond their reach. Consulting firms, public support agencies, and hybrid advisory organizations increasingly function as intermediaries that connect enterprises to technological trends, market intelligence, regulatory frameworks, and collaborative opportunities. However, the effectiveness of consulting interventions varies widely, reflecting differences in consulting models, firm level capabilities, and the broader socio economic environments in which enterprises operate. The challenge for both scholars and practitioners is to understand how consulting can be designed and deployed in ways that systematically enhance the innovation capacity and competitive performance of small and medium sized enterprises rather than producing only sporadic or superficial benefits.

A major contribution to this problem is provided by the complex model of business consulting for small and medium sized enterprises developed by Kovalchuk (2025). This model conceptualizes consulting as a multilevel system that integrates strategic, operational, and institutional dimensions of enterprise development. Rather than treating consulting as a discrete service delivered through standardized advice, Kovalchuk (2025) proposes that effective consulting must be embedded in the evolving life cycle of the firm and aligned with its internal capabilities as well as with the external innovation environment. This perspective resonates strongly with broader theoretical developments that emphasize the networked and knowledge based nature of modern economic activity (Grant, 1996a; Foray and Lundvall, 1996).

At the same time, an extensive body of research in management and entrepreneurship has demonstrated that the innovative performance of firms depends not only on their access to external knowledge but also on their ability to absorb, transform, and exploit that knowledge through internal processes and social relationships. The concept of absorptive capacity has been widely used to capture this dynamic, highlighting the importance of prior knowledge, organizational routines, and learning mechanisms in shaping how firms benefit from external inputs (Sancho Zamora et al., 2021; Ul Zia et al., 2022). Social capital, defined as the network of relationships, trust, and shared norms that facilitate collective action, has been shown to play a central role in enabling knowledge acquisition and innovation, particularly in young and resource constrained firms (Putnam, 2001; Yli Renko et al., 2001).

Despite the richness of these literatures, there remains a significant gap in understanding how business consulting, social capital, and absorptive capacity interact as part of a unified system that shapes innovation outcomes in small and medium sized enterprises. Much of the existing research treats consulting, networks, and organizational capabilities as separate analytical domains, leading to fragmented insights that fail to capture the complex interdependencies of real world enterprise development. The present study addresses this gap by integrating the complex consulting model proposed by Kovalchuk (2025) with network based and knowledge based theories of the firm in order to construct a comprehensive framework for analyzing how consulting mediated relationships influence innovation performance.

The theoretical foundations of this approach can be traced back to the emergence of the knowledge based economy paradigm, which posits that economic growth and competitive advantage increasingly depend on the creation, diffusion, and application of knowledge rather than on the accumulation of physical capital alone (Foray and Lundvall, 1996; Guellec, 1996). Within this paradigm, firms are viewed as social and organizational systems that specialize in the integration of distributed knowledge held by individuals and external partners (Grant, 1996b). Networks of collaboration, including alliances, partnerships, and consulting relationships, are thus not peripheral but central to the process of innovation and value creation (Gulati et al., 2000; Hagedoorn et al., 2000).

The literature on innovation systems further reinforces this perspective by emphasizing that firms operate within

complex institutional and technological environments that shape their opportunities and constraints (Edquist, 1997; Freeman, 1991). Regional and national innovation systems provide the infrastructure of universities, research institutes, financial institutions, and policy frameworks that support learning and technological development. Consulting organizations can be understood as part of this infrastructure, functioning as knowledge brokers that translate scientific and market knowledge into actionable strategies for firms, a role that aligns closely with the learning region concept articulated by Florida (1995).

However, the mere presence of consulting services and innovation infrastructure does not guarantee positive outcomes for small and medium sized enterprises. Empirical research has repeatedly shown that the benefits of network participation and external knowledge access are contingent on the quality of relationships, the alignment of incentives, and the internal capabilities of firms to make use of what they learn (Presutti et al., 2022; Wu and Qu, 2021). Social capital plays a decisive role in this process by shaping the trust, commitment, and mutual understanding that underpin effective collaboration. Without sufficient social capital, consulting relationships risk becoming transactional and superficial, limiting their impact on deep organizational learning and innovation (Putnam, 2001; Yli Renko et al., 2001).

Against this background, the central research problem of this article can be articulated as follows. How do complex business consulting models interact with social capital and absorptive capacity to influence the innovation performance of small and medium sized enterprises within networked knowledge economies. Addressing this question requires moving beyond narrow operational definitions of consulting and innovation to embrace a more holistic and dynamic understanding of enterprise development.

The contribution of this study is threefold. First, it provides a theoretically integrated framework that links the complex consulting architecture proposed by Kovalchuk (2025) with established theories of social capital, knowledge integration, and organizational innovativeness. Second, it offers a detailed methodological rationale for analyzing consulting mediated innovation processes through qualitative and interpretive approaches that capture the richness of interorganizational relationships. Third, it advances a set of analytically grounded propositions about how consulting systems can be designed to enhance the learning and innovation capabilities of small and medium sized enterprises in diverse economic contexts.

In pursuing these objectives, the article engages with a wide range of scholarly debates. One of the most prominent concerns the extent to which innovation is driven primarily by internal firm capabilities or by external network relationships. While early resource based theories emphasized the importance of unique internal assets, more recent network based perspectives have highlighted the role of interorganizational collaboration in generating novel combinations of knowledge (Gambardella, 1992; Dodgson, 1993). The complex consulting model bridges these perspectives by recognizing that external advice and networks only become valuable when they are effectively integrated into the firm's internal routines and strategic orientation, a process that is inherently social and organizational (Kovalchuk, 2025).

Another key debate revolves around the measurement and operationalization of social capital. While Putnam (2001) conceptualizes social capital in terms of generalized trust and civic engagement, organizational scholars have developed more fine grained measures that capture the structural, relational, and cognitive dimensions of interfirm networks (Yli Renko et al., 2001; Presutti et al., 2022). This article adopts a multidimensional view of social capital that allows for a nuanced analysis of how different types of relationships contribute to knowledge acquisition and innovation in the context of consulting mediated interactions.

Finally, the article contributes to ongoing discussions about the future of business consulting in the knowledge based economy. As technological change accelerates and competitive environments become more turbulent, traditional consulting models based on standardized best practices are increasingly inadequate. The complex consulting model articulated by Kovalchuk (2025) suggests a shift toward more adaptive, co creative, and network embedded forms of advisory support, a shift that has profound implications for how small and medium sized enterprises navigate the challenges of innovation and growth.

By bringing these strands of theory and evidence together, the present study seeks to advance a more comprehensive and practically relevant understanding of how consulting, social capital, and knowledge based capabilities interact to shape the innovation trajectories of small and medium sized enterprises.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach adopted in this study is grounded in the recognition that the phenomena under investigation, namely complex consulting systems, social capital, and innovation processes, are inherently relational, dynamic, and context dependent. Quantitative modeling, while valuable for testing specific hypotheses, often struggles to capture the richness of interorganizational interactions and the interpretive dimensions of knowledge exchange. For this reason, the present research employs a qualitative, theory driven methodology that synthesizes and interprets existing empirical and conceptual studies in order to construct a coherent analytical framework for understanding consulting mediated innovation in small and medium sized enterprises.

The primary methodological rationale draws on the tradition of theoretical integration within the fields of strategic management and innovation studies, where scholars have long combined insights from diverse literatures to develop more comprehensive explanatory models (Grant, 1996b; Freeman, 1991). By systematically examining how different theoretical constructs, such as absorptive capacity, social capital, and organizational innovativeness, relate to one another within the context of business consulting, it becomes possible to identify causal mechanisms and boundary conditions that would be difficult to observe through isolated empirical studies.

A central pillar of the methodology is the complex consulting model articulated by Kovalchuk (2025), which serves as the organizing framework for the analysis. This model conceptualizes consulting as a multilevel system comprising strategic orientation, operational support, and institutional embedding. Rather than treating these dimensions as independent, the model emphasizes their *взаимное влияние*, or mutual influence, in shaping the developmental trajectories of small and medium sized enterprises. In methodological terms, this implies that any analysis of consulting outcomes must consider how strategic advice, process improvement, and network integration interact over time to produce innovation and performance effects.

To operationalize this framework in a qualitative analytical context, the study employs a form of theoretical triangulation that draws on multiple streams of literature. The first stream concerns social capital and interorganizational networks, including seminal works on the role of trust, network structure, and relational embeddedness in facilitating knowledge flows (Putnam, 2001; Gulati et al., 2000). The second stream focuses on absorptive capacity and organizational learning, highlighting how firms identify, assimilate, and exploit external knowledge (Sancho Zamora et al., 2021; Yli Renko et al., 2001). The third stream addresses innovation systems and the knowledge based economy, situating firm level processes within broader institutional and technological environments (Edquist, 1997; Foray and Lundvall, 1996). By integrating these literatures with the consulting model of Kovalchuk (2025), the methodology enables a holistic interpretation of how consulting mediated relationships influence innovation.

The analytical procedure involves several interrelated steps, each grounded in rigorous scholarly reasoning. First, key constructs are identified and defined based on the literature. These include social capital, absorptive capacity, organizational innovativeness, and consulting architecture. Each construct is treated not as a static variable but as a dynamic set of processes and relationships. For example, social capital is understood to encompass structural connections, relational trust, and shared cognitive frames that evolve through repeated interaction (Presutti et al., 2022; Yli Renko et al., 2001). Absorptive capacity is conceptualized as a cumulative and path dependent capability that reflects prior knowledge, learning routines, and managerial cognition (Sancho Zamora et al., 2021).

Second, the relationships among these constructs are mapped using causal and interpretive logic derived from the literature. This involves identifying how consulting interventions can influence social capital by fostering new relationships and strengthening existing ones, how social capital in turn affects knowledge acquisition, and how absorptive capacity mediates the translation of knowledge into innovation. The complex consulting model of Kovalchuk (2025) provides a structured way to analyze these linkages by distinguishing between strategic, operational, and institutional levels of interaction.

Third, the methodological approach explicitly acknowledges the role of context. Small and medium sized enterprises operate in diverse national, regional, and sectoral environments, each characterized by different innovation systems, regulatory frameworks, and cultural norms. Rather than attempting to control for these factors statistically, the qualitative methodology treats context as an integral part of the explanatory framework. This is consistent with the innovation systems literature, which emphasizes that learning and technological

change are embedded in specific institutional settings (Edquist, 1997; Freeman, 1987).

Fourth, the study incorporates a critical evaluation of alternative explanations and potential limitations. For example, some scholars argue that firm performance is primarily driven by internal capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation rather than by external networks or consulting relationships (Grant, 1996a; Gambardella, 1992). Others contend that social capital can have negative effects by locking firms into closed networks that inhibit exposure to novel ideas (Gulati et al., 2000). By engaging with these counterarguments, the methodology seeks to provide a balanced and nuanced analysis that recognizes both the benefits and the risks associated with consulting mediated network engagement.

The methodological approach also addresses the issue of validity. In qualitative and theoretical research, validity is not established through statistical significance but through the coherence, plausibility, and explanatory power of the analytical framework. The present study enhances validity through extensive cross referencing of established theories and empirical findings. By demonstrating that the proposed relationships among consulting, social capital, absorptive capacity, and innovation are consistent with a wide range of scholarly evidence, the analysis gains robustness and credibility (Presutti et al., 2022; Ul Zia et al., 2022).

Reliability is addressed through transparent and systematic reasoning. Each major analytical step is explicitly grounded in the literature, allowing other researchers to trace the logic of the argument and to assess its consistency with existing knowledge. While qualitative synthesis does not produce replicable numerical results, it does produce replicable interpretive frameworks that can be applied and tested in future empirical studies (Wu and Qu, 2021).

Finally, the methodology acknowledges its own limitations. By relying on secondary literature and theoretical integration, the study cannot capture the full diversity of lived experiences within small and medium sized enterprises or the micro level dynamics of specific consulting relationships. Nevertheless, the aim of the research is not to provide detailed case descriptions but to develop a generalizable conceptual model that can inform both scholarly inquiry and practical intervention. In this sense, the methodology is well suited to the exploratory and integrative objectives of the study, aligning closely with the complex consulting paradigm articulated by Kovalchuk (2025).

RESULTS

The analytical synthesis of the literature and the application of the complex consulting model reveal several interrelated patterns that illuminate how business consulting, social capital, and absorptive capacity jointly shape innovation performance in small and medium sized enterprises. These results are not presented as statistical findings but as theoretically grounded insights that emerge from the convergence of multiple streams of research.

One of the most salient results is that consulting interventions which are structured according to a complex, multilevel architecture are more likely to generate sustained innovation outcomes than those based on fragmented or ad hoc advisory practices. The model proposed by Kovalchuk (2025) emphasizes the integration of strategic, operational, and institutional dimensions of consulting, and this integration appears to be critical for enabling firms to align external knowledge with internal capabilities. Strategic consulting provides the cognitive and directional framework that helps firms identify relevant technological and market opportunities, while operational consulting supports the implementation of new processes and routines. Institutional consulting, in turn, connects firms to broader networks of partners, funding agencies, and knowledge institutions, creating an ecosystem in which learning and innovation can flourish (Kovalchuk, 2025; Edquist, 1997).

A second key result concerns the mediating role of social capital in the relationship between consulting and innovation. The literature consistently shows that the value of external advice and network participation depends on the quality of relationships that firms establish with consultants, partners, and other stakeholders (Putnam, 2001; Presutti et al., 2022). High levels of trust, mutual commitment, and shared understanding facilitate open communication and reduce the perceived risks associated with sharing sensitive information. When consulting relationships are embedded in strong social capital, small and medium sized enterprises are more willing to experiment with new ideas and to invest in collaborative innovation projects (Yli Renko et al., 2001; Wu and Qu, 2021).

This finding aligns closely with the network based view of innovation, which holds that novel knowledge often

emerges from the recombination of diverse perspectives and experiences (Gulati et al., 2000; Hagedoorn et al., 2000). Consulting organizations that act as network brokers can play a particularly important role in this process by introducing firms to new partners and by facilitating the exchange of ideas across organizational and sectoral boundaries. However, the effectiveness of this brokerage function is contingent on the development of relational and cognitive social capital, without which network ties remain superficial and transactional (Putnam, 2001; Presutti et al., 2022).

A third major result pertains to the role of absorptive capacity as a dynamic capability that enables firms to transform external knowledge into innovation. Absorptive capacity is not simply a function of prior technical expertise but is deeply influenced by organizational culture, learning routines, and managerial cognition (Sancho Zamora et al., 2021; Ul Zia et al., 2022). Consulting interventions that focus solely on transferring information or best practices without addressing these deeper organizational factors are unlikely to produce lasting change. By contrast, the complex consulting model of Kovalchuk (2025) explicitly incorporates mechanisms for building learning capabilities, such as training, coaching, and reflective practice, thereby enhancing the firm's ability to absorb and apply new knowledge.

The literature on organizational innovativeness further supports this interpretation. Innovativeness reflects a firm's openness to new ideas, willingness to take risks, and capacity to implement change, all of which are shaped by leadership, culture, and structural flexibility (Wang and Ahmed, 2004; Gjerding, 1997). Consulting relationships that foster experimentation and encourage cross functional collaboration can strengthen these attributes, creating a virtuous cycle in which increased absorptive capacity leads to greater innovation, which in turn reinforces the value of external networks (Kovalchuk, 2025; Sancho Zamora et al., 2021).

A fourth result relates to the heterogeneity of small and medium sized enterprises and the contingent nature of consulting outcomes. The literature on born global firms and internationalization highlights that young, technology based enterprises often rely heavily on social capital and external knowledge to compete in global markets (Presutti et al., 2022; Yli Renko et al., 2001). For these firms, consulting relationships that provide access to international networks and market intelligence can be particularly valuable. However, firms operating in more traditional or locally oriented sectors may derive greater benefit from consulting focused on process innovation and organizational development (Wu and Qu, 2021; Dodgson, 1993).

This heterogeneity underscores the importance of tailoring consulting architectures to the specific needs and contexts of client firms, a principle that lies at the heart of the complex consulting model (Kovalchuk, 2025). Rather than applying standardized solutions, effective consultants must diagnose the firm's existing social capital, absorptive capacity, and strategic orientation in order to design interventions that align with its developmental stage and competitive environment.

Finally, the results suggest that consulting mediated innovation is deeply embedded in broader innovation systems and institutional frameworks. Access to public research institutions, financial support, and regulatory guidance can significantly amplify the impact of consulting by providing complementary resources and legitimacy (Edquist, 1997; Freeman, 1987). Consulting organizations that are well connected to these institutions can act as integrators of system level knowledge, helping small and medium sized enterprises navigate complex policy landscapes and identify opportunities for collaboration and funding (Kovalchuk, 2025; Florida, 1995).

Taken together, these results paint a picture of business consulting as a multifaceted and relational process that operates at the intersection of firm level capabilities and network based innovation systems. Social capital and absorptive capacity emerge as critical mediators that determine whether consulting relationships translate into meaningful innovation outcomes, reinforcing the central thesis that effective enterprise development in the knowledge based economy requires integrated and context sensitive support structures (Putnam, 2001; Sancho Zamora et al., 2021).

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study invite a deep theoretical reflection on the nature of business consulting, social capital, and innovation in the contemporary knowledge based economy. By integrating the complex consulting model articulated by Kovalchuk (2025) with network and capability based theories, it becomes possible to move beyond simplistic notions of advisory services toward a more sophisticated understanding of consulting as an institutionalized form of knowledge mediation.

One of the most important theoretical implications concerns the reconceptualization of consulting as a component of the innovation system rather than as an external add on to firm activity. Traditional views of consulting often portray consultants as experts who deliver solutions to client problems in a relatively linear and transactional manner. However, the complex consulting model emphasizes that consulting relationships are co creative and iterative, involving continuous interaction between consultants and client firms across strategic, operational, and institutional dimensions (Kovalchuk, 2025). This perspective aligns closely with the network based view of innovation, which holds that learning and technological change emerge from ongoing collaboration among heterogeneous actors (Hagedoorn et al., 2000; Gulati et al., 2000).

Within this framework, social capital is not merely a background condition but a central mechanism through which consulting relationships generate value. The literature on social capital demonstrates that trust, shared norms, and relational embeddedness reduce transaction costs, facilitate knowledge sharing, and support collective problem solving (Putnam, 2001; Yli Renko et al., 2001). In the context of consulting, these attributes enable firms to engage more openly with external advisors, to disclose sensitive information, and to experiment with new ideas without excessive fear of opportunism. The development of social capital thus enhances the depth and quality of consulting interactions, transforming them from superficial exchanges into genuine learning partnerships (Presutti et al., 2022).

At the same time, the discussion must acknowledge that social capital is not unambiguously beneficial. Strong ties and cohesive networks can lead to redundancy of information and resistance to change, particularly if firms become locked into closed circles of familiar partners (Gulati et al., 2000). The challenge for consulting organizations is therefore to balance bonding and bridging social capital, fostering trust and commitment while also exposing firms to diverse and novel sources of knowledge. The complex consulting model implicitly addresses this challenge by emphasizing institutional embedding, which connects firms to broader innovation networks and prevents insularity (Kovalchuk, 2025; Florida, 1995).

The role of absorptive capacity further deepens the theoretical understanding of consulting mediated innovation. Absorptive capacity captures the firm's ability to recognize the value of external knowledge, assimilate it, and apply it for commercial ends (Sancho Zamora et al., 2021; Ul Zia et al., 2022). This capability is cumulative and path dependent, shaped by prior investments in human capital, organizational routines, and learning culture. Consulting interventions that do not engage with these internal processes may produce temporary improvements but are unlikely to lead to sustained innovation. By contrast, consulting architectures that prioritize capability building, as advocated by Kovalchuk (2025), can generate long term benefits by strengthening the firm's capacity to learn from its environment.

The discussion also highlights important tensions within the literature on innovation and firm performance. Some scholars argue that innovation is primarily driven by entrepreneurial vision and internal resources, suggesting that external support plays a secondary role (Gambardella, 1992; Grant, 1996a). Others emphasize the centrality of networks and alliances in accessing complementary assets and reducing uncertainty (Dodgson, 1993; Hagedoorn et al., 2000). The integrated framework developed in this study suggests that these perspectives are not mutually exclusive. Internal capabilities and external relationships are deeply intertwined, with consulting acting as a bridge that aligns the two. Firms with strong internal innovativeness are better able to leverage external advice, while rich network connections provide the raw material for internal learning and experimentation (Wang and Ahmed, 2004; Kovalchuk, 2025).

From a policy and practice perspective, the discussion underscores the need for more sophisticated support structures for small and medium sized enterprises. Public programs and private consulting markets often emphasize short term problem solving and compliance oriented advice, neglecting the deeper processes of capability development and network integration. The complex consulting model suggests that more holistic and long term oriented interventions are required to foster sustainable innovation (Kovalchuk, 2025; Edquist, 1997). This may involve closer collaboration between consulting organizations, universities, financial institutions, and policy agencies to create integrated innovation ecosystems.

The limitations of the present study must also be considered. As a theoretical and integrative analysis, it cannot capture the full diversity of consulting practices or the idiosyncratic experiences of individual firms. Empirical research is needed to test and refine the proposed framework across different contexts and sectors. Nevertheless, the strength of the present approach lies in its ability to synthesize a wide range of insights into a

coherent explanatory model, providing a foundation for future empirical and policy oriented work (Presutti et al., 2022; Wu and Qu, 2021).

In sum, the discussion reinforces the central argument that effective business consulting for small and medium sized enterprises must be understood as a networked, knowledge based, and socially embedded process. By integrating strategic guidance, operational support, and institutional connections, complex consulting architectures can enhance social capital, build absorptive capacity, and ultimately drive innovation and competitive performance in the knowledge based economy (Kovalchuk, 2025; Foray and Lundvall, 1996).

CONCLUSION

The analysis presented in this article has sought to illuminate the intricate relationships among business consulting, social capital, absorptive capacity, and innovation in small and medium sized enterprises. By grounding the discussion in the complex consulting model developed by Kovalchuk (2025) and integrating insights from the literature on networks, knowledge based economies, and organizational capabilities, the study provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how consulting mediated relationships can support sustainable enterprise development.

The central conclusion is that consulting cannot be reduced to the provision of expert advice but must be conceptualized as a dynamic system of knowledge mediation embedded in broader innovation networks. Social capital and absorptive capacity emerge as critical mediators that determine whether external inputs translate into meaningful innovation outcomes. For scholars, this framework offers a rich basis for future empirical research, while for practitioners and policymakers it highlights the importance of designing consulting and support programs that foster learning, trust, and network integration rather than merely delivering standardized solutions.

REFERENCES

1. Grant, R. (1996b). Toward a Knowledge based Theory of the Firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 109–122.
2. Presutti, M., Capiello, G., and Johanson, M. (2022). Analysing social capital and product innovativeness in the relationship evolution of born global companies the mediating role of knowledge acquisition. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 18, 1347–1371.
3. Edquist, C., ed. (1997). *Systems of Innovation Technology, Institutions and Organisation*. London, Pinter.
4. Kovalchuk, A. (2025). Complex model of business consulting for small and medium-sized enterprises. Theory, methodology and practice of implementation. <https://doi.org/10.25313/kovalchuk-monograph-2025-90>
5. Wu, H., and Qu, Y. (2021). Exploratory and exploitative internationalization Effects of social capital antecedents and fit moderators of innovation consequence. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 16, 3120–3135.
6. Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital Measurement and consequences. *Kennedy School*, 1–32.
7. Grant, R. (1996a). Prospering in Dynamically competitive Environments Organizational Capability as Knowledge Integration. *Organization Science*, 7, 375–387.
8. Florida, R. (1995). Toward the Learning Region. *Futures*, 27, 527–536.
9. Sancho Zamora, R., Gutierrez Broncanos, S., Hernandez Perlines, F., and Pena Garcia, I. (2021). A multidimensional study of absorptive capacity and innovation capacity and their impact on business performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
10. Hagedoorn, J., Link, A. N., and Vonortas, N. S. (2000). Research Partnerships. *Research Policy*, 29, 567–586.
11. Gulati, R., Nohria, N., and Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic Networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 203–215.
12. Foray, D., and Lundvall, B. A. (1996). The knowledge based economy From the economics of knowledge to the learning economy. Aalborg, Department of Business Studies.
13. Wang, C. L., and Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organisational innovativeness

construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7, 303–313.

14. Yli Renko, H., Autio, E., and Sapienza, H. J. (2001). Social capital, knowledge acquisition, and knowledge exploitation in young technology based firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 587–613.
15. Dodgson, M. (1993). *Technological Collaboration in Industry*. London, Routledge.
16. Freeman, C. (1991). Networks of innovators A synthesis of research issues. *Research Policy*, 20, 499–514.
17. Ul Zia, N., Burita, L., and Yang, Y. (2022). Inter organizational social capital of firms in developing economies and industry four readiness The role of innovative capability and absorptive capacity. *Review of Managerial Science*.
18. Geroski, P. A. (1990). Innovation, Technological Opportunity, and Market Structure. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 42, 586–602.
19. Gambardella, A. (1992). Competitive Advantages from In house Scientific research The US Pharmaceutical industry in the 1980s. *Research Policy*, 21, 391–401.
20. Freeman, C. (1987). *Technology Policy and Economic Performance Lessons from Japan*. London, Pinter.
21. Gjerding, A. N., ed. (1997). *Den Fleksible Virksomhed Omstillingpres og Fornyelse i Dansk Erhvervsliv*. Copenhagen, Erhvervsudviklingsradet.