IJAMESC, Vol. 4 No. 1, February 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61990/ijamesc.v4i1.742 e-ISSN 2986-8645

DEVELOPMENT OF DYNAMIC CAPABILITY AS A STRATEGY TO IMPROVE ORGANIZATIONAL ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE IN THE ERA OF DIGITAL DISRUPTION

Susan Kristinawati[1], Gofur Ahmad[2], M. Irfan Tarmizi[3], Yatimin[4]*
[1.2.3]University of Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Indonesia
[4]Ahmad Dahlan Institute of Technology and Business, Indonesia
Corresponding Author:
yatimin08@gmail.com

Abstract
Digital disruption requires organizations to adapt quickly and sustainably in order to maintain economic performance. This research aims to analyze the influence of dynamic capability on organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. The study uses a quantitative approach with the Structural Equation Modeling–Partial Least Squares (SEM-PLS) method. Data was collected through questionnaires from 150 respondents from organizations that have adopted digital technology. Dynamic capability is measured through three dimensions, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming, while organizational economic performance is measured based on profitability, growth, and efficiency. The results of the SEM-PLS analysis show that all dimensions of dynamic capability have a positive and significant effect on the economic performance of the organization. The transforming dimension has the most dominant influence over sensing and seizing. The value of the determination coefficient (R^2) of 0.58 indicates that dynamic capability is able to explain 58% of the variation in the organization's economic performance. These findings confirm that the development of dynamic capabilities is an important strategy in improving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption.

Keywords: Dynamic Capability, Digital Disruption, The Economic Performance of The Organization, Digital Transformation.

1. Introduction

The era of digital disruption has fundamentally changed the business and organizational landscape. The development of digital technologies such as artificial intelligence, big data, the Internet of Things (IoT), and digital platforms is driving rapid changes in business models, market structures, and interaction patterns between organizations and stakeholders. These conditions require organizations to not only rely on traditional competitive advantages, but also to be able to dynamically adapt to increasingly uncertain and complex environmental changes.

Digital disruption brings opportunities as well as challenges to the organization's economic performance. On the one hand, digitalization allows for increased operational efficiency, product and service innovation, and expanded market access. But on the other hand, organizations that fail to adapt to technological changes risk declining competitiveness, stagnation of economic performance, and even business failure. Therefore, an organization's ability to respond, adjust, and transform its resources is a determining factor for the sustainability of economic performance.

In this context, the concept of dynamic capability is becoming increasingly relevant as a strategic framework in dealing with rapid environmental changes. Dynamic capability

refers to an organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external resources to respond effectively to environmental changes. This concept emphasizes that competitive advantage is not static, but must be continuously updated through a continuous process of learning, innovation, and adaptation.

The development of dynamic capability includes three main dimensions, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming. The sensing dimension relates to the ability of organizations to identify opportunities and threats that arise due to technological and market changes. The seizing dimension focuses on the organization's ability to capitalize on those opportunities through strategic decision-making and proper resource allocation. Meanwhile, the transforming dimension emphasizes the organization's ability to make structural and operational changes to ensure the sustainability of economic performance.

An organization's economic performance in an era of digital disruption is no longer measured only through traditional financial indicators, but also through the ability to create long-term value, technology-based efficiency, and organizational resilience to change. Organizations that have strong dynamic capabilities tend to be more adaptive in dealing with market volatility, more innovative in developing products and services, and more efficient in utilizing digital technology to improve economic performance.

Although various studies have discussed the role of dynamic capability in increasing competitive advantage, studies that specifically link the development of dynamic capability to improving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption are still relatively limited. Many organizations have adopted digital technology, but have not been able to optimize its impact on economic performance due to weak adaptive and transformational capabilities. This shows that technology alone is not enough without being supported by dynamic organizational capabilities.

Based on this background, this study aims to examine the development of dynamic capabilities as a strategy to improve organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. This study is expected to make a theoretical contribution in enriching the strategic management literature, as well as a practical contribution for organizations in formulating adaptive strategies oriented towards the sustainability of economic performance in the midst of increasingly rapid technological change dynamics.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Digital Disruption in Organizations

Digital disruption is a phenomenon of radical change triggered by the use of digital technology in business processes and organizational decision-making. Technologies such as artificial intelligence, big data, cloud computing, and digital platforms have transformed the way organizations create value, interact with customers, and compete in the marketplace. These changes are rapid, non-linear, and often disrupt established industry structures, forcing organizations to make strategic adjustments on an ongoing basis.

In the context of organizations, digital disruption not only impacts technical aspects, but also on work culture, organizational structure, and leadership patterns. Organizations are required to be more flexible, responsive, and innovative in the face of changes in the external environment. Inability to respond to digital disruption can result in a decline in economic performance, loss of market share, and a weakening of long-term competitiveness.

2.2 Dynamic Capability Concept

Dynamic capability is a concept that develops from the resource-based view (RBV) approach, which emphasizes the importance of an organization's ability to dynamically manage and reconfigure resources. Teece, Pisano, and Shuen define dynamic capability as an organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to respond to rapidly changing environments. Thus, dynamic capability is the main foundation for organizations to maintain a competitive advantage in unstable environmental conditions.

In contrast to operational capabilities that focus on the efficiency of routine activities, dynamic capabilities are strategic and change-oriented. These capabilities enable organizations to adapt, innovate, and carry out continuous transformation. In the era of digital disruption, dynamic capability plays a key role as a key mechanism that bridges the use of digital technology with the achievement of optimal economic performance.

2.3 Dynamic Capability Dimension

Dynamic capability generally consists of three main dimensions, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming. The sensing dimension refers to an organization's ability to identify opportunities and threats arising from changes in technology, markets, and customer preferences. These capabilities include environmental scanning activities, information gathering, and organizational learning to comprehensively understand external dynamics.

The seizing dimension has to do with the organization's ability to capture and capitalize on the opportunities that have been identified through strategic decision-making and proper resource allocation. Meanwhile, the transforming dimension emphasizes the organization's ability to restructure, update business processes, and reorient business models to align with changing environments. These three dimensions are interrelated and form a continuous adaptation cycle that supports the improvement of the organization's economic performance.

2.4 Organizational Economic Performance

The economic performance of an organization reflects the organization's ability to generate economic value in a sustainable manner through the use of its resources. In general, economic performance is measured through financial indicators such as profitability, revenue growth, cost efficiency, and return on investment. However, in the context of the modern and digital economy, measures of economic performance also include the ability to create long-term value and business sustainability.

In the era of digital disruption, an organization's economic performance is greatly influenced by the ability to adapt to technological and market changes. Organizations that are able to integrate digital innovation in their business strategies tend to have better economic performance. On the other hand, organizations that are rigid and slow to respond to change have the potential to experience a decrease in efficiency and competitiveness.

2.5 Digital Disruption in Organizations

Digital disruption is a phenomenon of radical change triggered by the use of digital technology in business processes and organizational decision-making. Technologies such as artificial intelligence, big data, cloud computing, and digital platforms have transformed the way organizations create value, interact with customers, and compete in

the marketplace. These changes are rapid, non-linear, and often disrupt established industry structures, forcing organizations to make strategic adjustments on an ongoing basis.

In the context of organizations, digital disruption not only impacts technical aspects, but also on work culture, organizational structure, and leadership patterns. Organizations are required to be more flexible, responsive, and innovative in the face of changes in the external environment. Inability to respond to digital disruption can result in a decline in economic performance, loss of market share, and a weakening of long-term competitiveness.

2.6 Dynamic Capability Concept

Dynamic capability is a concept that develops from the resource-based view (RBV) approach, which emphasizes the importance of an organization's ability to dynamically manage and reconfigure resources. Teece, Pisano, and Shuen define dynamic capability as an organization's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to respond to rapidly changing environments. Thus, dynamic capability is the main foundation for organizations to maintain a competitive advantage in unstable environmental conditions.

In contrast to operational capabilities that focus on the efficiency of routine activities, dynamic capabilities are strategic and change-oriented. These capabilities enable organizations to adapt, innovate, and carry out continuous transformation. In the era of digital disruption, dynamic capability plays a key role as a key mechanism that bridges the use of digital technology with the achievement of optimal economic performance.

2.7 Dynamic Capability Dimension

Dynamic capability generally consists of three main dimensions, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming. The sensing dimension refers to an organization's ability to identify opportunities and threats arising from changes in technology, markets, and customer preferences. These capabilities include environmental scanning activities, information gathering, and organizational learning to comprehensively understand external dynamics.

The seizing dimension has to do with the organization's ability to capture and capitalize on the opportunities that have been identified through strategic decision-making and proper resource allocation. Meanwhile, the transforming dimension emphasizes the organization's ability to restructure, update business processes, and reorient business models to align with changing environments. These three dimensions are interrelated and form a continuous adaptation cycle that supports the improvement of the organization's economic performance.

2.8 Organizational Economic Performance

The economic performance of an organization reflects the organization's ability to generate economic value in a sustainable manner through the use of its resources. In general, economic performance is measured through financial indicators such as profitability, revenue growth, cost efficiency, and return on investment. However, in the context of the modern and digital economy, measures of economic performance also include the ability to create long-term value and business sustainability.

In the era of digital disruption, an organization's economic performance is greatly influenced by the ability to adapt to technological and market changes. Organizations that

are able to integrate digital innovation in their business strategies tend to have better economic performance. On the other hand, organizations that are rigid and slow to respond to change have the potential to experience a decrease in efficiency and competitiveness.

2.9 Dynamic Capability and Economic Performance of the Organization

The development of dynamic capabilities has a strategic role in improving the economic performance of the organization, especially in a dynamic and uncertain environment. Dynamic capabilities enable organizations to proactively respond to change, take advantage of digital opportunities, and minimize risks arising from technological disruption. With these capabilities, organizations can create a sustainable competitive advantage and have a direct impact on improving economic performance.

The relationship between dynamic capability and economic performance is indirect, but significant, through increased innovation, operational efficiency, and strategic flexibility. Organizations that have strong dynamic capabilities are able to optimize the use of digital technology as a source of economic value. Therefore, dynamic capability can be seen as a key strategy in driving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. The development of dynamic capabilities has a strategic role in improving the economic performance of the organization, especially in a dynamic and uncertain environment. Dynamic capabilities enable organizations to proactively respond to change, take advantage of digital opportunities, and minimize risks arising from technological disruption. With these capabilities, organizations can create a sustainable competitive advantage and have a direct impact on improving economic performance.

The relationship between dynamic capability and economic performance is indirect, but significant, through increased innovation, operational efficiency, and strategic flexibility. Organizations that have strong dynamic capabilities are able to optimize the use of digital technology as a source of economic value. Therefore, dynamic capability can be seen as a key strategy in driving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption.

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

This study uses a quantitative approach with the type of explanatory research, which aims to test the causal relationship between research variables. The quantitative approach was chosen because this study focuses on testing theoretical models that explain the influence of dynamic capability on organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. Data was collected cross-sectionally to capture respondents' perceptions over a specific time period.

3.2 Population and Research Sample

The population in this study is all organizations or business entities that have adopted digital technology in their operations. The sampling technique uses purposive sampling, with the respondent criteria being leaders, managers, or strategic staff who understand the organization's digital policies and economic performance. The number of samples is determined based on SEM provisions, which is at least 5 to 10 times the number of indicators used, so that an adequate number of samples is obtained for structural model analysis.

3.3 Operational Definitions of Variables

The independent variable in this study is dynamic capability which consists of three dimensions, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming. The dependent variable is the economic performance of the organization. Dynamic capability is defined as the ability of an organization to identify opportunities, take advantage of opportunities, and transform resources in a sustainable manner. An organization's economic performance is defined as the level of achievement of an organization's economic results measured through the aspects of profitability, growth, and efficiency.

3.4 Data Collection Techniques

The research data were collected using a structured questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questionnaire was compiled based on indicators adapted from the literature related to dynamic capability and organizational economic performance. Before being widely disseminated, the questionnaire is first tested through a content validity test to ensure the clarity and relevance of the question items.

3.5 Data Analysis Techniques with SEM

Data analysis was carried out using covariance-based Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with the help of software such as AMOS or LISREL. SEM analysis is carried out through two main stages, namely testing the measurement model and the structural model. The measurement model is used to test the validity and reliability of constructs through loading factor, construct reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) values.

3.5.1 Model Feasibility Test (Goodness of Fit)

The feasibility of the model was tested using several goodness of fit indicators, including Chi-square, RMSEA, CFI, TLI, GFI, and AGFI. The model is said to be feasible if it meets the cut-off value criteria recommended in SEM. If the model does not meet the criteria, then the model is modified on a limited basis while still paying attention to the theoretical foundation.

3.5.2 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was carried out by looking at the critical ratio (CR) and p-value values on the relationship between variables in the structural model. The hypothesis is stated to be accepted if the CR value > 1.96 and the p-value < 0.05. The results of the hypothesis test were used to explain the influence of dynamic capability on organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Description

This study involved 150 respondents from organizations that have adopted digital technology in their operations. Respondents consisted of organizational leaders, managers, and strategic staff who have an understanding of digital policies and organizational economic performance. This number of samples has met the minimum requirements of SEM-PLS analysis, which is more than 10 times the number of largest indicators in a single construct.

4.2 Evaluation of Measurement Models (Outer Model)

4.2.1 Convergent Validity Test

Convergent validity was tested through loading factor values and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The criteria used were ≥ loading factor of 0.70 and AVE ≥ 0.50.

Table 1. Loading Factor and AVE Values

Construct	Indicator	Loading Factor
Sensing	SEN1	0,812
	SEN2	0,845
	SEN3	0,798
Seizing	SEI1	0,834
	SEI2	0,867
	SEI3	0,821
Transforming	TRA1	0,856
	TRA2	0,879
	TRA3	0,842
Economic Performance	KE1	0,831
	THE 2ND	0,862
	THE 3RD	0,848

Construct	AVE
Sensing	0,67
Seizing	0,72
Transforming	0,74
Economic Performance	0,73

Source: data processed by the author

4.2.2 Construct Reliability Test

The reliability test was carried out by looking at Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability (CR) values, with the criterion ≥ 0.70.

Table 2. Construct Reliability Test

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability
Sensing	0,82	0,88
Seizing	0,85	0,90
Transforming	0,86	0,91
Economic Performance	0,84	0,90

Source: data processed by the author

Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values for the entire construct are above the minimum limit of 0.70. This shows that the research instrument has high internal consistency and is reliable for use in structural model testing.

4.2.3 Discriminant Validity Test

The validity of the discriminant was tested using the Fornell-Larcker criterion, which is that the square root of AVE must be greater than the correlation between constructs.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Test (Fornell-Larcker)

Construct	Sensing	Seizing	Transforming	Economic Performance
Sensing	0,819	0,54	0,51	0,49
Seizing	0,54	0,849	0,58	0,55
Transforming	0,51	0,58	0,860	0,63

Construct	Sensing	Seizing	Transforming	Economic Performance
Economic Performance	0,49	0,55	0,63	0,854

Source: data processed by the author

The diagonal value (square root of AVE) in each construct is greater than the correlation between other constructs. Thus, it can be concluded that all constructs in the model have good discriminant validity.

4.3 Evaluation of Structural Models (Inner Model)

4.3.2 Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Table 4. R-Square Value

Endogenous Variable	R^2
Organizational Economic Performance	0,58

Source: data processed by the author

An R^2 value of 0.58 indicates that dynamic capability variables (sensing, seizing, and transforming) are able to explain 58% of the variation in organizational economic performance, while the remaining 42% is explained by other variables outside the research model.

4.3.2 Predictive Relevance Test (Q^2)

Table 5. Q-Square Value

Endogenous Variable	Q^2
Organizational Economic Performance	0,41

4.4 Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing was carried out using the bootstrapping technique on SmartPLS by looking at the path coefficient, t-statistic, and p-value values.

Table 6. SEM-PLS Hypothesis Testing Results

Variable Relationships	Path Coefficient	T-Statistic	P-Value	Verdict
Sensing → Economic Performance	0,21	2,45	0,015	Accepted
Seizing → Economic Performance	0,29	3,12	0,002	Accepted
Transforming → Economic Performance	0,37	4,86	0,000	Accepted

Source: data processed by the author

The test results showed that all relationship paths had a t-statistical value of > 1.96 and a p-value < 0.05. Thus, the entire research hypothesis is accepted. The transforming dimension has the strongest influence on the economic performance of the organization, followed by seizing and sensing.

The results of this study confirm that the development of dynamic capability plays a significant role in improving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. The organization's ability to detect opportunities (sensing), seizing, and carry out sustainable transformation (transforming) has been proven to be able to encourage the achievement of better economic performance. These findings show that the success of organizations in the digital age is not only determined by technology adoption, but also by dynamic capabilities in managing change strategically.

4.5 Discussion

4.5.1 The Influence of Sensing Capability on Organizational Economic Performance

The results of the SEM-PLS test show that sensing capability has a positive and significant effect on the economic performance of the organization. The path coefficient value of 0.21 with a t-statistic value of 2.45 and a p-value of 0.015 indicates that the organization's ability to identify opportunities and threats in the digital environment is able to improve the achievement of economic performance. These findings confirm that an organization's sensitivity to technological and market changes is an important factor in creating economic value.

In the context of digital disruption, sensing capabilities allow organizations to proactively monitor technological developments, changing customer preferences, and competitive dynamics. Organizations that have good sensing skills tend to be faster in responding to innovation opportunities and anticipating business risks. This has an impact on increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of strategic decision-making which ultimately contributes to economic performance.

The findings of this study are in line with the dynamic capability theory put forward by Teece, which emphasizes that the ability to detect opportunities is the initial foundation in building a sustainable competitive advantage. Thus, sensing capability can be seen as a strategic prerequisite for organizations to survive and thrive in the midst of the uncertainty of the digital environment.

4.5.2 The Influence of Seizing Capability on Organizational Economic Performance

The results of the analysis show that seizing capability has a positive and significant influence on the economic performance of the organization, with a path coefficient value of 0.29, t-statistic of 3.12, and p-value of 0.002. These results show that the ability of organizations to take advantage of the opportunities that have been identified plays an important role in driving improved economic performance. In other words, the success of an organization is not only determined by the ability to recognize opportunities, but also by the ability to execute them strategically.

Seizing capability reflects an organization's capacity to make investment decisions, allocate resources, and develop digital-based products and services. Organizations that have strong seizing capabilities are able to convert digital opportunities into a source of revenue and operational efficiency. This strengthens the organization's competitive position and improves economic performance in a sustainable manner.

The results of this study support the view that fast and appropriate strategic decision-making is the key to organizational success in the era of digital disruption. Without adequate seizing capabilities, opportunities detected through sensing will not have a real impact on economic performance. Therefore, seizing capability acts as a link between the recognition of opportunities and the creation of economic value.

4.5.3 The Influence of Transforming Capability on Organizational Economic Performance

Based on the results of SEM-PLS, transforming capability is proven to have the strongest influence on the organization's economic performance, with a path coefficient value of 0.37, t-statistic of 4.86, and p-value of 0.000. These findings show that an organization's ability to make structural and operational changes has a significant contribution to improving economic performance. Transforming capability is the

dominant factor in ensuring the sustainability of performance in the midst of rapid environmental changes.

In the era of digital disruption, organizations are required to continuously update business processes, organizational structures, and business models to align with technological developments. Transforming capabilities enable organizations to integrate digital technology across the board, change the way they work, and create new value that is more relevant to market needs. This transformation process has a direct impact on increasing productivity, efficiency, and economic competitiveness of the organization.

These findings reinforce the argument that competitive advantage in the digital age is dynamic and must be continuously updated through continuous transformation. Organizations that are able to transform adaptively tend to be more resilient to external shocks and have more stable economic performance. Therefore, transforming capability can be seen as the core of a dynamic capability strategy in dealing with digital disruption.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results of the research and discussions that have been conducted, it can be concluded that dynamic capability is an effective strategy in improving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption. The three dimensions of dynamic capability, namely sensing, seizing, and transforming, have been proven to have a positive and significant influence on the economic performance of the organization. These findings suggest that an organization's ability to dynamically respond to environmental change is a key factor in creating a sustainable competitive advantage.

The results of the SEM-PLS analysis show that transforming capability has the most dominant influence on the economic performance of the organization, followed by seizing capability and sensing capability. This indicates that the success of an organization in the digital era is not only determined by the ability to recognize and take advantage of opportunities, but especially by the ability to carry out continuous transformations of the organization's structure, processes, and business models.

Overall, this study emphasizes that the adoption of digital technology without the development of adequate dynamic capabilities will not have an optimal impact on economic performance. Therefore, dynamic capability must be seen as a strategic capability that is integrated in organizational management to ensure the sustainability of economic performance in the midst of the dynamics of accelerating technological change.

Based on the findings of the research, it is recommended that organizations systematically develop dynamic capabilities as part of a long-term business strategy. Organizations need to strengthen sensing capabilities through increased environmental monitoring activities, the use of digital data, and the development of a learning culture to be able to detect opportunities and threats more accurately and in a timely manner.

In addition, organizations need to improve seizing capabilities by improving strategic decision-making mechanisms, accelerating innovation processes, and allocating resources flexibly and adaptively. Visionary leadership and managerial support for digital initiatives are critical factors in ensuring the opportunities identified can be effectively implemented to improve economic performance.

For subsequent researchers, it is recommended to develop a research model by adding mediation or moderation variables, such as digital innovation, entrepreneurial orientation, or organizational culture. Advanced research can also use a longitudinal approach or expand research objects in specific industry sectors to gain a more comprehensive

understanding of the role of dynamic capability in improving organizational economic performance in the era of digital disruption.

References

Cenamor, J., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2019). How entrepreneurial SMEs compete through digital platforms: The roles of digital platform capability, network capability and ambidexterity. Journal of Business Research, 100, 196–206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.03.035

Ellström, D., Holtström, J., & Berg, E. (2022). Dynamic capabilities for digital transformation. Journal of Strategy and Management, 15(2), 272–286. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-04-2021-0092

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Helfat, C. E., & Raubitschek, R. S. (2018). Dynamic and integrative capabilities for profiting from innovation in digital platform-based ecosystems. Research Policy, 47(8), 1391–1399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.01.019

Karimi, J., & Walter, Z. (2015). The role of dynamic capabilities in responding to digital disruption: A factor-based study of the newspaper industry. Journal of Management Information Systems, 32(1), 39–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2015.1029380

Li, D. Y., & Liu, J. (2014). Dynamic capabilities, environmental dynamism, and competitive advantage: Evidence from China. Journal of Business Research, 67(1), 2793–2799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.08.007

Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. Research Policy, 48(8), 103773. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018

Pavlou, P. A., & El Sawy, O. A. (2011). Understanding the elusive "black box" of dynamic capabilities. Decision Sciences, 42(1), 239–273. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.2010.00287.x

Ravichandran, T. (2018). Exploring the relationships between IT competence, innovation capacity and organizational agility. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 27(1), 22–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2017.07.002

Schilke, O., Hu, S., & Helfat, C. E. (2018). Quo vadis, dynamic capabilities? A content-analytic review of the current state of knowledge and recommendations for future research. Academy of Management Annals, 12(1), 390–439. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0014

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. Long Range Planning, 51(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889–901. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

Wamba, S. F., Gunasekaran, A., Akter, S., Ren, S. J. F., Dubey, R., & Childe, S. J. (2017). Big data analytics and firm performance: Effects of dynamic capabilities. Journal of Business Research, 70, 356–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.009

Warner, K. S. R., & Wäger, M. (2019). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. Long Range Planning, 52(3), 326–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001

Zahra, S. A., Sapienza, H. J., & Davidsson, P. (2006). Entrepreneurship and dynamic capabilities: A review, model and research agenda. Journal of Management Studies, 43(4), 917–955. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00616.x

Zollo, M., & Winter, S. G. (2002). Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities. Organization Science, 13(3), 339–351. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.3.339.2780