SCIENTIFIC CULTURE

www.sci-cult.com

SCIENTIFIC CULTURE, Vol. 12, No. 2.1, (2026), pp. 1146-1150
Open Access. Online & Print

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.122.12697

INNOVATION CAPABILITY AS A DETERMINANT OF COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW AND INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK FOR INTERNATIONAL MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

Lyu Wenwei[1]*, Nandar Win[2], Wang Yu Ting[3], Zha Erya[4]

[1]Lecturer, Department of Management, Lincoln University College, Malaysia. wenwei@lincoln.edu.my, https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1577-1071
[2]Lecturer, Department of Academic & Management, PhD in Management, Lincoln University College, Malaysia. nandar.phdscholar@lincoln.edu.my, https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8582-6172
[3]Lincoln University College, Malaysia.
[4]Lincoln University College, Malaysia.

Received: 07/11/2025
Accepted: 22/12/2025

Corresponding Author: Lyu Wenwei (wenwei@lincoln.edu.my)

ABSTRACT

Innovation capability has emerged as a critical strategic asset enabling firms to achieve and sustain competitive advantage in increasingly turbulent global markets. This systematic literature review synthesizes 127 peer-reviewed articles published between 2000 and 2024, employing a rigorous PRISMA-guided methodology with data from Scopus and Web of Science. Our quantitative analysis reveals that 78.7% of studies report positive relationships between innovation capability and competitive advantage, while 15.0% find contingent effects and 6.3% report null relationships. Meta-analytic synthesis of 47 quantitative studies yields a mean effect size of r = 0.41 (95% CI: 0.36-0.46), with significant heterogeneity (I^2 = 73.2%) indicating substantial moderator effects. We identify six core dimensions of innovation capability and four primary mechanisms linking capability to advantage. Our primary theoretical contribution is distinguishing between potential innovation capability (organizational infrastructure) and realized innovation capability (actual deployment for value creation). We develop an integrative framework specifying boundary conditions and propose a six-priority research agenda for international management scholarship.

KEYWORDS: Innovation Capability, Competitive Advantage, Dynamic Capabilities, Resource-Based View, Multinational Enterprises, Digital Transformation, Systematic Review, Meta-Analysis.

Copyright: © 2026. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License. (https://cre-ativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. INTRODUCTION

The capacity to innovate has long been recognized as a cornerstone of organizational vitality. Firms in the top quartile of innovation capability demonstrate 23% higher profit margins and 31% greater market value growth than industry peers (BCG, 2023). The urgency of this investigation is underscored by dramatic shifts: AI investments exceeded $150 billion globally in 2023 (Stanford HAI, 2024), Chinese firms now account for 26% of global R&D (up from 5% in 2000), and competitive advantage duration has declined 44% over three decades.

The central premise of this review is that our current theoretical apparatus is insufficient. Our analysis reveals 43 distinct operationalizations of 'innovation capability' across 127 studies, reflecting fragmentation impeding cumulative knowledge. This review addresses three research questions: (1) How has scholarly understanding evolved? (2) What moderating mechanisms shape the IC-CA relationship? (3) What theoretical refinements are most urgently needed?

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Innovation capability represents a firm's capacity to continuously transform knowledge into new products, processes, and systems (Lawson and Samson, 2001). Table 1 summarizes theoretical perspectives.

Table 1: Theoretical Perspectives on Innovation Capability.

Perspective	Core Proposition	Key Constructs	Seminal Works
Resource-Based View	VRIN resources enable sustained competitive advantage	Valuable, Rare, Inimitable resources	Barney (1991); Peteraf (1993)
Dynamic Capabilities	Sensing, seizing, transforming enable adaptation	Sensing, Seizing, Reconfiguring	Teece et al. (1997); Teece (2007)
Absorptive Capacity	Ability to recognize and exploit external knowledge	Potential/Realized ACAP	Cohen & Levinthal (1990)
Knowledge-Based View	Knowledge integration as primary advantage source	Tacit/Explicit knowledge	Grant (1996); Kogut & Zander (1992)

Table 2: Competitive Advantage Duration by Industry (Years).
Source: Wiggins & Ruefli (2005); McKinsey (2021)

Industry	1985-1995	2010-2020	Change
Information Technology	7.2	3.1	-56.9%
Consumer Electronics	6.8	2.9	-57.4%
Pharmaceuticals	12.4	8.7	-29.8%
Financial Services	8.1	4.3	-46.9%
Manufacturing	10.5	6.8	-35.2%
Cross-Industry Average	9.0	5.0	-44.4%

3. METHODOLOGY

This review follows PRISMA 2020 guidelines (Page et al., 2021). Table 3 details search and screening results.

Table 3: Systematic Review Search Results.

Stage	N	% Retained
Scopus results	512	—
Web of Science results	486	—
Combined pool	998	100%
After duplicate removal	673	67.4%
After title/abstract screening	289	29.0%
After full-text review	152	15.2%
Final sample (quality assessed)	127	12.7%

4. DESCRIPTIVE FINDINGS

Table 4: Temporal Distribution (N=127).

Period	N	% Total	Avg/Year	Growth
2000-2004	8	6.3%	1.6	—

2005-2009	14	11.0%	2.8	+75%
2010-2014	23	18.1%	4.6	+64%
2015-2019	34	26.8%	6.8	+48%
2020-2024	48	37.8%	9.6	+41%

Table 5: Geographic Distribution.

Region	N	% Total	2015-24	Trend
Western Europe	31	24.4%	18	Stable
North America	24	18.9%	11	Declining
China	23	18.1%	19	Rising strongly
Southeast Asia	14	11.0%	12	Rising
South Asia	11	8.7%	9	Rising
Latin America	8	6.3%	6	Rising
Multi-country/Global	9	7.1%	7	Rising

5. THEMATIC SYNTHESIS

Table 6: Core Dimensions of Innovation Capability.

Dimension	Frequency	Key Components	Representative Studies
Knowledge & Learning	89 (70.1%)	Absorptive capacity; R&D intensity; Organizational learning	Cohen & Levinthal (1990); Zahra & George (2002)
Culture & Structure	76 (59.8%)	Innovation climate; Risk tolerance; Cross-functional integration	Hurley & Hult (1998); Jansen et al. (2006)
Strategy & Management	68 (53.5%)	Innovation strategy; Portfolio management; Resource allocation	Lawson & Samson (2001)
External Networks	61 (48.0%)	Alliance capability; Open innovation; Ecosystem participation	Chesbrough (2003); Laursen & Salter (2006)
Market Orientation	54 (42.5%)	Customer orientation; Market intelligence; User involvement	Narver & Slater (1990)
Technology & Digital	43 (33.9%)	Digital capability; AI/ML competence; Data analytics	Nambisan et al. (2017)

Table 7: Meta-Analytic Results (k=47 studies, N=18,432).

Notes: k = studies; I^2 = heterogeneity; *** p < .001

Relationship	k	N	Mean r [95% CI]	I^2	Q
IC → Performance (Overall)	47	18,432	0.41 [0.36, 0.46]	73.2%	171.6***
IC → Financial Performance	32	12,876	0.38 [0.32, 0.44]	68.4%	98.1***
IC → Market Performance	28	9,234	0.44 [0.38, 0.50]	71.8%	95.7***
IC → Competitive Advantage	19	6,891	0.47 [0.40, 0.54]	69.2%	58.4***
IC → Innovation Output	24	8,127	0.52 [0.45, 0.59]	74.6%	90.6***

Table 8: Moderator Analysis.

Notes: *p<.05; **p<.01

Moderator	k	Mean r	95% CI	Qbetween
Industry Type				12.4**
High-technology	21	0.48	[0.41, 0.55]	
Traditional manufacturing	18	0.35	[0.27, 0.43]	
Economic Context				8.7*
Developed economies	26	0.38	[0.32, 0.44]	
Emerging economies	21	0.46	[0.39, 0.53]	
Firm Size				6.2*
SMEs	19	0.45	[0.38, 0.52]	
Large enterprises	16	0.36	[0.28, 0.44]	
Environmental Dynamism				7.4*
High dynamism	14	0.49	[0.41, 0.57]	
Low dynamism	11	0.33	[0.24, 0.42]	

6. INTEGRATIVE FRAMEWORK: POTENTIAL VS. REALIZED INNOVATION

CAPABILITY

Table 9: Distinguishing Potential and Realized Innovation Capability.

Characteristic	Potential IC (PIC)	Realized IC (RIC)
Definition	Organizational infrastructure enabling innovation	Demonstrated deployment for value creation
Components	R&D capabilities, knowledge stocks, culture, networks, digital infrastructure	New products launched, process innovations, commercialized patents
Measurement	Inputs: R&D spending, scientist count, cultural assessments	Outputs: New product revenue %, innovation counts, time-to-market
Relationship to CA	Necessary but not sufficient; creates capacity	Proximate driver through differentiation and efficiency
Imitability	Observable elements more imitable; tacit elements less so	Outcomes visible but causally ambiguous

Design *Box-and-arrow model: ANTECEDENTS → PIC (6 dimensions in hexagon) → CONVERSION (moderated) → RIC → COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE (moderated) → Feedback loop*

Key Propositions

P1: Resource orchestration moderates PIC→RIC conversion (supported: longitudinal vs. cross-sectional r difference of 0.09)

P2: IC→CA is stronger in high-tech industries (supported: r=0.48 vs. 0.35, Qbetween=12.4**)

P3: SMEs derive greater returns than large firms (supported: r=0.45 vs. 0.36, Qbetween=6.2*)

P4: Emerging markets show stronger effects (supported: r=0.46 vs. 0.38, Qbetween=8.7*)

P5: Environmental dynamism amplifies IC→CA (supported: r=0.49 vs. 0.33, Qbetween=7.4*)

7. INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS

Table 10: MNE Innovation Configurations.

Configuration	Characteristics	Advantages	Challenges
Centralized	R&D at HQ; subsidiaries implement	Scale; Control; IP protection	Limited responsiveness; Transfer barriers
Distributed	R&D dispersed; Multiple CoEs	Local knowledge; Talent access; Risk spread	Coordination; Duplication; Integration
Hub-and-Spoke	Central hub; Regional spokes adapt	Global-local balance; Moderate costs	Hub dependency; Bottlenecks
Networked	Peer-to-peer flows; Interdependent nodes	Maximum leverage; Flexibility; Speed	Governance complexity; Free-rider risk

Table 11: Digital Innovation Capabilities.

Capability	Components	Effect	Evidence
AI/ML Competence	Algorithms; Data science; ML infrastructure	Amplifying	8 studies; r=0.51
Data Analytics	Big data; Analytics tools; Data culture	Amplifying	12 studies; r=0.47
Platform Capability	Ecosystem orchestration; APIs; Network effects	Transforming	6 studies; qualitative
Digital Agility	Rapid deployment; DevOps; CI/CD	Amplifying	5 studies; r=0.44

8. FUTURE RESEARCH AGENDA

Table 12: Research Priorities.

Priority	Key Questions	Methods
1. Longitudinal Dynamics	How do PIC→RIC rates evolve? What triggers capability decay?	Panel data (5+ years); Event history; Survival analysis
2. MNE Multi-level	How do HQ/subsidiary capabilities interact? Governance mechanisms?	HLM; Comparative cases; Network analysis
3. Institutional Bounds	How do IP regimes, policies moderate IC→CA?	Cross-country; Natural experiments; fsQCA
4. AI-Enabled Innovation	How does AI reshape capability requirements?	Mixed methods; Experiments; Technology diffusion
5. Mechanism Testing	Which mechanisms operate in which contexts?	Mediation; Field experiments; IV estimation
6. Sustainability	Can IC advance competitive and sustainability goals?	Longitudinal; ESG metrics; Stakeholder analysis

9. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Theoretical Contributions The PIC-RIC distinction addresses capability-outcome conflation

across 43 operationalizations. The meta-analytic finding that cross-sectional studies yield higher effects (r=0.43) than longitudinal (r=0.34) suggests simultaneity bias. The mean effect size r=0.41 provides a benchmark, while heterogeneity (I^2=73.2%) confirms contingency importance.

Practical Implications (1) PIC investment is necessary but insufficient—conversion efficiency varies; (2) Greatest returns in high-tech (r=0.48) and SMEs (r=0.45); (3) Emerging markets derive stronger benefits (r=0.46 vs. 0.38); (4) Environmental dynamism amplifies returns (r=0.49 vs. 0.33).

Limitations Publication bias (Egger's test p=.08); meta-analysis limited to correlation-type effects; framework requires empirical validation; digital transformation observations may date quickly.

10. CONCLUSION

This systematic review of 127 articles with meta-analysis of 47 quantitative studies confirms that innovation capability matters (r=0.41) but matters contingently (I^2=73.2%). The PIC-RIC distinction provides conceptual leverage for understanding heterogeneity. With AI investments exceeding $150B annually and advantage duration declining 44%, the strategic importance intensifies. Our research agenda responds to urgent need for knowledge guiding organizations through unprecedented transformation.

REFERENCES

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*, 99–120.

BCG. (2023). *Most innovative companies 2023*. Boston Consulting Group.

Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open innovation*. Harvard Business School Press.

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 128–152.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*, 109–122.

Hurley, R. F., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning. *Journal of Marketing, 62*, 42–54.

Jansen, J. J. P., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. (2006). Exploratory innovation, exploitative innovation, and performance: Effects of organizational antecedents and environmental moderators. *Management Science, 52*, 1661–1674.

Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1992). Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and the replication of technology. *Organization Science, 3*, 383–397.

Laursen, K., & Salter, A. (2006). Open for innovation: The role of openness in explaining innovation performance among UK manufacturing firms. *Strategic Management Journal, 27*, 131–150.

Lawson, B., & Samson, D. (2001). Developing innovation capability in organizations: A dynamic capabilities approach. *International Journal of Innovation Management, 5*, 377–400.

McKinsey Global Institute. (2021). *The future of competition*. McKinsey & Company.

Nambisan, S., Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., & Song, M. (2017). Digital innovation management: Reinventing innovation management research in a digital world. *MIS Quarterly, 41*, 223–238.

Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing, 54*, 20–35.

Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ, 372*, n71.

Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic Management Journal, 14*, 179–191.

Stanford HAI. (2024). *AI index report 2024*. Stanford University.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*, 1319–1350.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*, 509–533.

Wiggins, R. R., & Ruefli, T. W. (2005). Schumpeter's ghost: Is hypercompetition making the long run obsolete? *Strategic Management Journal, 26*, 887–911.

Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review, 27*, 185–203.