

An Overview of Employees' Dynamic Capabilities, Job Performance with Innovative Work Behavior: A Conceptual Paper

Mohammad Bataineh

Received: 10 December 2019 Accepted: 5 January 2020 Published: 15 January 2020

Abstract

8 This paper focuses on the theoretical review of employees' dynamic capabilities, innovative
9 work behavior, and job performance. It also determines the mediating role of innovative work
10 behavior on the nexus between employees' dynamic capabilities and job performance.
11 Dynamic capabilities become a fundamental source of competitive advantage through the
12 mediating role of innovative work behavior. The review of previous studies indicates that the
13 dynamic capabilities of employees have not studies indicates that as a distinct subject.

Index terms—

1 Introduction

17 t is necessary to provide insights into the mechanism of new employees' dynamic capabilities on job performance
18 to aptly show the value to contemporary organizations. Lack of such insights appears to be the major weakness
19 of dynamic capabilities (Bie'nkowska and Tworek, 2020). It is fundamental to note that the concept of
20 dynamic capabilities as meta-capabilities has been receiving considerable attention in both theory and practice
21 of management (Bie'nkowska and Tworek, 2020). Notwithstanding the interpretation ambiguity and dearth of
22 consistent theoretical underpinnings ??Arend et al, 2009), several studies have considered it as a vital condition
23 to attain a long-term competitive advantage (Bie'nkowska and Tworek, 2020; Pisano, 2017; Teece, 2007).

Though employees are considered as one of its fundamental pillars, the literature rarely discusses the dynamic capabilities of employees as a distinct subject of study rather the literature considers it as a component of dynamic capabilities (Bie'nkowska and Tworek, 2020). Besides, the empirical studies in this field are either large-scale surveys that cannot recognize the differences in firms' actual practices and processes, or single case studies, which are difficult to compare with other studies. Some empirical studies have recently reviewed the state-of-the-art approaches ??

2 ii. Innovative Work behavior

³¹ It refers to the purposeful creation, introduction, and application of new ideas within a work role, group, or organization with a view to benefiting the role performance, group or organization ??Janssen, 2000, p. 288).

3 iii. Job performance

34 Performance is considered as a measure of the capability to do greater work than expected, setting high goals,
35 the achievement of a set goal, and the efficacy of the time used in doing work. Essentially, performance can be
36 categorized into low or high performance (Podsakoff et al. 1982).

³⁷ 4 b) Literature review i. Employees' Dynamic Capabilities

According to Teece et al. (1997), an organizational process that is shaped by the asset positions of the firm and molded by its evolutionary paths describe the essence of the firm's dynamic capabilities and competitive advantage. The two vital aspects of their study are 'capabilities' and 'dynamic'. Specifically, 'capabilities'

5 C) INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

41 underscore the fundamental role of strategic management in properly integrating, adapting, and reconfiguring
42 both external and internal organizational resources, skills, and functional competences to meet the prerequisites of
43 a changing environment (Teece et al., 1997). Conversely, 'dynamic' connotes the capability to renew competencies
44 to attain congruence with the changing business environment. Essentially, certain innovative reactions are needed
45 when time-to-market and timing are critical, when there is a rapid rate of technological change, and when it is
46 difficult to determine the nature of future competition and markets (Teece et al., 1997).

47 The measures of sensitivity to changes in the environment, the ability to adapt to changes in the environment,
48 the ability to solve problems in the workplace (e.g., workplace innovation), and the ability for continuous personal
49 development (Bie ´nkowska and Tworek, 2020).

50 Most researches that addressed the dynamic capabilities approach revealed the absence of consensus, which
51 could be attributed to the different ways they viewed the two aspects of the initial definition of this concept. First,
52 dynamic capabilities emphasize the firm's internal processes aimed at developing and renewing the capacities and
53 resources of the firm. Second, the purpose is to adapt or adjust to the changing conditions of the environment.
54 Although the first method to the concept seemed to relate 'dynamic' with the changing environmental conditions
55 (Teece & Pisano, 1994), the latter contribution showed that it emphasizes the changes are happening in the
56 capacities and resources of the firm.

57 Furthermore, dynamic capabilities as metacapabilities are receiving attention in both theory and practice of
58 management. Several scholars considered them as the necessary conditions required for long-term competitive
59 advantage (Pisano, 2017 and Teece, 2007). Specifically, Teece et al., (1997) provided the theoretical foundation for
60 dynamic capabilities when they asserted that dynamic capabilities are "the firm's ability to integrate, build, and
61 reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environment". Similarly, Eisenhardt
62 and Martin (2000) posited that dynamic capabilities signify "the firm's processes that use resources-specifically
63 the processes that integrate, reconfigure, gain and release resources-to match and even create market change".

64 In addition, dynamic capabilities imply the higher-order capabilities which are required to change the firm's
65 operational practices and resource base, as well as, to learn new domains (e.g., Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009;
66 Ellonen, Wikstro ´m, & Jantunen, 2009). For instance, new kinds of learning (e.g., innovations) are the outcomes
67 of a firm's combinative capabilities to create new applications from the existing knowledge. Fundamentally,
68 dynamic capabilities engender a faster, better, more efficient, and effective innovation process that easily provides
69 new prospects in business operations (Wu et al., 2007).

70 Abdullah, et al. (2020) emphasized the need to underline the mechanism of the influence of EDC on employees'
71 job performance to precisely unveil its value for contemporary organizations. Empirically, some researches
72 have confirmed the influence of EDC on job performance as it relates to the crucial role it plays in attaining
73 organizations' sustainable development ??Hazana et al., 2020). Specifically, the diverse ways through which
74 dynamic capabilities positively influence firm performance include: matching the resource base with the changing
75 environments (Teece et al., 1997); supporting both the resource-picking and capabilitybuilding rent-generating
76 mechanisms (Makadok, 2001); creating the market change (Eisenhardt and Martin, 2000), and improving inter-
77 firm performance (Gudergan et al., 2012). Fundamentally, dynamic capabilities enhance the speed, efficiency and
78 effectiveness of organizational reactions to environmental instability (Chmielewski and Paladino, 2007; Hitt et
79 al., 2001), which eventually improves performance.

80 5 c) Innovative Work behavior

81 Innovation is considered as an essential source of organizational survival, since firms are gradually interested
82 in unveiling the factors that promote innovative work behavior. Undoubtedly, innovation plays a fundamental
83 role in organizational competitiveness (Shalley, Gilson & Blum, 2009), albeit it is impossible for organizational
84 to be innovative without their employees. In this regard, Agarwal (2014, p. 43) opined that "one option for
85 organizational to become more innovative is to encourage their employees to be innovative". Besides, some
86 researches have revealed that innovation is important for organizational performance (Jiménez-Jiménez and
87 Sanz-Valle, 2011; Thornhill, 2006) since organizations can react to challenges quicker, and better exploit the new
88 products and market opportunities.

89 A large number of practitioners and scientists have concluded that innovation by individual employees serves
90 as a means to promote organizational success (e.g., Van de Ven, 1986; Smith, 2002). Innovative work behavior
91 (IWB) refers to the individual's intentional behaviors to create and implement new and beneficial ideas with the
92 intention of providing benefits to the individual, group, or organization. From this definition, IWB goes beyond
93 creativity, though creativity is a vital element of IWB, particularly at the beginning when generating new and
94 beneficial ideas (Scott and Bruce, 1994). Therefore, innovative outputs could range from the enlargement, and
95 renewal of products, services, processes and procedures to the development of new management systems and new
96 production techniques ??Crossan and Apayd in, 2010; ??idd et al., 2001).

97 Conversely, previous researches have shown that IWB is fundamental in producing a sustainable competitive
98 advantage (Van de Ven, 1986), albeit an understanding of the way employees can be encouraged to show IWB
99 has not been thoroughly explored (Janssen, 2000).

100 Precisely, research interest in innovation at the firm level regarding the knowledge of the way innovation can
101 be promoted at the individual level is still limited.

102 At the individual level, innovation is considered as innovative work behavior, and it differs from creativity,

103 which is a more limited construct that focuses on the discovery and generation of ideas. Besides, innovative
104 work behavior is wider than the proactive work behavior construct (Parker, Williams and Turner, 2006) that
105 stresses the implementation of change, but do not determine the initiation of the innovation process. For instance,
106 earlier research on individual innovation conducted by Hurt et al. (1977) posited that innovative work behavior
107 is personality-based, and generally defined as the willingness to change. Some empirical studies have indicated
108 that individuals who are able and willing to innovate, expand their contribution beyond the scope of their job
109 requirements as they attain incessant flow of innovations (Parker, Williams and Turner, 2006).

110 Based on some previous studies (Kanter, 1988; West and Farr, 1989), Scott and Bruce (1994) appraised three
111 aspects, namely, idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization, to develop the concept of innovative work
112 behavior. Essentially, idea generation is the creation of new ideas for problematic issues, while idea promotion
113 is the mobilization of support for innovative ideas. Besides, idea realization is the transformation of innovative
114 ideas into beneficial applications. The perspective offers an updated viewpoint of innovative work behavior
115 developed on a one-dimension model (Janssen, 2000); a two-dimension model developed by Krause (2004) Based
116 on the observation that good idea is the foundation of all innovations, an individual reasonably play crucial
117 roles in innovation since they are the custodians and processors of ideas (Van de Ven, 1986). Therefore, IWB
118 is considered as individual's behaviors that intentionally produce, introduce, and utilize new ideas, products, or
119 processes. IWB is regarded as an extra-role, or discretionary behavior that goes beyond the expected prescribed
120 role, but not expected from the employees (Janssen, 2000). Besides, IWB refers to individual actions which are
121 directed to generate, process and implement new ideas, product, procedures, technologies, and work processes
122 with a view to to boost the organization's effectiveness, and success (Kleijnen & Street, 2001; Yuan & Woodman,
123 2010).

124 The literature on innovative work behavior has emphasized the significance of outcome expectations since the
125 expected outcomes of behavior determine human behaviors. Precisely, Yuan and Woodman (2010) reported that
126 expected image gain or loss and expected performance improvement have significant influences on innovative work
127 behavior. The study provided empirical evidence to support a positive relationship between expected positive
128 performance outcomes and innovative behavior.

129 6 d) Job performance

130 Job performance is considered as one of the fundamental dimensions in organizational goal achievement. Hence,
131 it is expected that performance will contribute to organizational goals as one of the organization's competitive
132 advantage. Typically, job performance represents action and behavior which are under individuals' control that
133 contributed to the achievement of organizational goals (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002). It integrates the concept of
134 activity to carry out tasks and the outcome. According to Campbell and Wiernik (2015), the economy of a nation
135 is driven by aggregate individuals' job performance in every organization. Besides, Motowidlo, and Kell (2012)
136 described job performance as "the total expected value to the organization of the discrete behavioral episodes
137 that an individual carries out over a standard period".

138 Moreover, job performance connotes the aggregated organizational value of the set of employee's behaviors
139 that directly and indirectly contributes to organizational goals (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990).
140 Since there are numerous types of behaviors that could contribute to the attainment of organizational goals,
141 the extant literature contends that job performance is a construct that encompasses diverse components (e.g.,
142 Katz and Kahn 1978; Rotundo and Sackett 2002). In this regard, Motowidlo, and Borman (1993) categorized
143 job performance into task performance and contextual performance. Although there is an empirical relationship
144 between the two constructs, they are different (Hoffman et al. 2007). Specifically, contextual performance
145 comprises courtesy, altruism, peacekeeping, cheerleading, civic virtue, sportsmanship, and conscientiousness
146 (Podsakoff, and MacKenzie 2006), while task performance indicates meeting or surpassing the quantitative and
147 qualitative requirements of one's job (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

148 The theories of performance postulate that performance is a function of ability and motivation (Vroom,
149 1964). However, Waldman and Spangler (1989) extended this viewpoint and developed a model that consists of
150 factors that determine performance. They included two categories of variables in their model names, individual
151 characteristics that comprise experience, ability, and motivational factors, as well as the immediate work
152 environment factors such as leader behavior and group processes.

153 Several researchers agreed that job performance is a multi-dimensional construct (Campbell, 1990; Sonnentag
154 et al., 2008). For instance, Campbell (1990) suggested eight elements of job performance, such as written and
155 oral communication task proficiency, job-specific task proficiency, non-jobspecific task proficiency, maintenance of
156 personal discipline, demonstration of effort, supervision or leadership, facilitation of peer and team performance,
157 and management, or administration.

158 7 II.

159 8 Theoretical Framework a) Employees' Dynamic Capabilities 160 and Innovative

161 Work behavior Dynamic capabilities allow the organization to adjust its product portfolio with a view to
162 match the needs of the market and customer. Thorough dynamic capabilities, organizations can develop
163 and refine their innovative capabilities ??Lisboa, Skarne, & Lages, 2011). However, when generated and
164 adopted, innovations have effects on the organization (Fagerberg, 2005). In this regard, Makkonen et al. (2014)
165 reported that dynamic capabilities and innovation provide a competitive advantage to the organization and
166 boost their evolutionary fitness. Consequently, this study proposes the following hypothesis: H1: Employee's
167 dynamic capabilities have a positive effect on innovative work behavior b) Employees' Dynamic Capabilities,
168 Innovative Work behavior, and Job performance This section proposes that the impact of dynamic capabilities
169 on performance is mediated by the organization's innovative work behavior or more tangible capabilities that are
170 revamped by dynamic capabilities. In this regard, Eisenhardt & Martin (2000) posited that dynamic capabilities
171 are more prominent via the process of learning that creates innovative work behavior. Hence, acting mostly
172 within the internal environment of organizational learning is considered as one of the vital organization's internal
173 processes. Consequently, can mediate the nexus between dynamic capabilities and performance. Through the
174 mediation of innovative work behavior, dynamic capabilities become a major source of competitive advantage
175 (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Although several researchers have acknowledged that innovation and dynamic
176 capabilities have positive impacts on performance, the relationship could be mediated by innovation (Jimenez-
177 Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2011). Moreover, it is necessary to investigate such nexus since dynamic capabilities could
178 have an insignificant direct effect on performance (Protogerou et al., 2008). Therefore, this study proposes the
179 need to determine the mediating role of innovation on the nexus between dynamic capabilities and performance
180 (Giniuniene and Jurksiene, 2015). H2: Innovative work behavior mediates the relationship between employee's
181 dynamic capabilities and job performance.

182 9 III.

183 10 Methodology

184 The methodology employed in this study comprises library search, and evaluation of previous literature on
185 employees' dynamic capabilities, innovative work behavior, and job performance. Specifically, the library search
186 covers both online and offline materials, such as journal articles. The references are obtained from online databases
187 in Web of Science, Science Direct, Scopus, and Google Scholar. This study restricts the advance search to the
188 nexus between employees' dynamic capabilities, innovative work behavior, and job performance. The references
189 are only taken from published journal articles. However, the limitation of this study is the limited resources
190 obtained from databases, and the novelty of the nexus between employees' dynamic capabilities, innovative work
191 behavior, and job performance.

192 IV.

193 11 Conclusion

194 This study has succeeded in developing a theoretical framework that will be valuable for future researches in this
195 subject. It has provided new insights into the impact of employees' dynamic capabilities on job performance using
196 innovative work behavior as a mediator. Hence, it may be necessary for companies to recombine and transform
197 knowledge and resources to produce innovation in the presence of good integrative processes and good learning
198 mechanisms. This study presents a self-constructed framework concerning the extant literature. Therefore, it is
199 recommended that a similar study should be conducted in a different sector.

200 [Ghobadian et al. ()] , A Ghobadian , N O'regan , T Howard , D Gallear , D A Chmielewski , A Paladino . 2007.

201 [Crossan and Apaydin ()] 'A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of
202 the literature'. M M Crossan , M Apaydin . *Journal of management studies* 2010. 47 (6) p. .

203 [Arend and Bromiley ()] *Assessing the dynamic capabilities view: spare change, everyone*, R J Arend , P Bromiley
204 . 2009.

205 [Van De Ven ()] 'Central problems in the management of innovation'. A H Van De Ven . *Management science*
206 1986. 32 (5) p. .

207 [Abdullah et al. ()] 'Creative Self-Efficacy, Innovative Work Behaviour and Job Performance among Selected
208 Manufacturing Employees'. N H Abdullah , E Wahab , A Shamsuddin . *The Journal of Social Sciences
209 Research* 2019. 5 (2) p. .

210 [Scott and Bruce ()] 'Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the
211 workplace'. S G Scott , R A Bruce . *Academy of management journal* 1994. 37 (3) p. .

212 [Hitt et al. ()] 'Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional
213 service firms: A resource-based perspective'. M A Hitt , L Bierman , K Shimizu , R Kochhar . *Academy of
214 Management journal* 2001. 44 (1) p. .

215 [Driving a resource orientation: reviewing the role of resource and capability characteristics] *Driving a resource
216 orientation: reviewing the role of resource and capability characteristics*, (Management Decision)

217 [Makkonen et al. ()] 'Dynamic capabilities and firm performance in a financial crisis'. H Makkonen , M Pohjola
218 , R Olkkonen , A Koponen . *Journal of Business Research* 2014. 67 (1) p. .

219 [Teece et al. ()] 'Dynamic capabilities and strategic management'. D J Teece , G Pisano , A Shuen . *Strategic
220 management journal* 1997. 18 (7) p. .

221 [Protogerou et al. ()] 'Dynamic capabilities and their indirect impact on firm performance'. A Protogerou , Y
222 Caloghirou , S Lioukas . *Paper in 25th DRUID Conference "Entrepreneurship and innovation -organizations,
223 institutions, systems and regions*, (Copenhagen, Denmark) 2008.

224 [Giniuniene and Jurksiene ()] 'Dynamic capabilities, innovation and organizational learning: Interrelations and
225 impact on firm performance'. J Giniuniene , L Jurksiene . *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 2015. 213
226 p. .

227 [Eisenhardt and Martin ()] 'Dynamic capabilities: what are they'. K M Eisenhardt , J A Martin . *Strategic
228 management journal*, 2000. 21 p. .

229 [Borman and Motowidlo ()] *Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance*, W
230 C Borman , S M Motowidlo . 1993.

231 [Hoffman et al. ()] 'Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of the OCB literature'. B J Hoffman
232 , C A Blair , J P Meriac , D J Woehr . *Journal of Applied psychology* 2007. 92 (2) p. 555.

233 [Teece ()] *Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and micro foundations of (sustainable) enterprise
234 performance*. *Strategic management journal*, D J Teece . 2007. 28 p. .

235 [Krause ()] *Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related
236 behaviors: An empirical investigation*. *The leadership quarterly*, D E Krause . 2004. 15 p. .

237 [West and Farr ()] 'Innovation at work: Psychological perspectives'. M A West , J L Farr . *Social behaviour* 1989.

238 [Jiménez-Jiménez and Sanz-Valle ()] 'Innovation, organizational learning, and performance'. D Jiménez-Jiménez
239 , R Sanz-Valle . *Journal of business research* 2011. 64 (4) p. .

240 [Yuan and Woodman ()] 'Innovative behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome
241 expectations'. F Yuan , R W Woodman . *Academy of management journal* 2010. 53 (2) p. .

242 [Lisboa et al. ()] 'Innovative capabilities: Their drivers and effects on current and future performance'. A Lisboa
243 , D Skarmeas , C Lages . *Journal of Business Research* 2011. 64 (11) p. .

244 [Wu et al. ()] 'Intellectual capital, dynamic capabilities and innovative performance of organisations'. S H Wu ,
245 L Y Lin , M Y Hsu . *International Journal of Technology Management* 2007. 39 (3-4) p. .

246 [Shalley et al. ()] *Interactive effects of growth need strength, work context, and job complexity on self*, C E Shalley
247 , L L Gilson , T C Blum . 2009. (reported creative)

248 [Janssen ()] 'Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour'. O Janssen .
249 *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 2000. 73 (3) p. .

250 [Bie?kowska and Tworek ()] *Job performance model based on Employees' Dynamic Capabilities (EDC)*, A
251 Bie?kowska , K Tworek . 2020. p. 2250. (Sustainability)

252 [Motowidlo and Kell ()] *Job performance*. *Handbook of Psychology*, S J Motowidlo , H J Kell . 2012. p. 12.
253 (Second Edition)

11 CONCLUSION

254 [Sonnenstag et al. ()] *Job performance. The SAGE Handbook of Organizational*, S Sonnenstag , J Volmer , A
255 Psychala . 2008.

256 [Katz and Kahn ()] D Katz , R L Kahn . *The social psychology of organizations*, (New York) 1978. Wiley. 2 p.
257 528.

258 [Agarwal ()] 'Linking justice, trust and innovative work behaviour to work engagement'. U A Agarwal . *Personnel
259 Review* 2014.

260 [Parker et al. ()] 'Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work'. S K Parker , H M Williams , N Turner
261 . *Journal of applied psychology* 2006. 91 (3) p. 636.

262 [Campbell ()] *Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology*, J P
263 Campbell . 1990.

264 [Dorenbosch et al. ()] *On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through
265 production ownership. Creativity and innovation management*, L Dorenbosch , M L V Engen , M Verhagen .
266 2005. 14 p. .

267 [Organ et al. ()] *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*, D W Organ , P
268 M Podsakoff , S B Mackenzie . 2006. Sage Publications.

269 [Waldman and Spangler ()] 'Putting together the pieces: A closer look at the determinants of job performance'.
270 D A Waldman , W D Spangler . *Human Performance* 1989. 2 (1) p. .

271 [Messmann et al. ()] 'Relations between vocational teachers' characteristics of professionalism and their innovative
272 work behaviour'. G Messmann , R H Mulder , H Gruber . *Empirical research in vocational education and
273 training*, 2010. 2 p. .

274 [Hurt et al. ()] 'Scales for the measurement of innovativeness'. H T Hurt , K Joseph , C D Cook . *Human
275 Communication Research* 1977. 4 (1) p. .

276 [Gudergan et al. ()] *Strategic implications for (non-equity) alliance performance. Long Range Planning*, S P
277 Gudergan , T Devinney , N F Richter , R S Ellis . 2012. 45 p. .

278 [Teece and Pisano ()] 'The dynamics capabilities of firms: an introduction'. D J Teece , G Pisano . *Industrial
279 and Corporate Change* 1994. 3 (3) p. .

280 [Campbell and Wiernik ()] *The modeling and assessment of work performance*, J P Campbell , B M Wiernik .
281 2015.

282 [Smith ()] 'The new leader: bringing creativity and innovation to the workplace'. G P Smith . *Chart Your Course*
283 2002. Conyers.

284 [Fagerberg et al. (ed.) ()] *The Oxford handbook of innovation*, J Fagerberg , D C Mowery , Nelson . R. R. (ed.)
285 2005. Oxford university press.

286 [Shane and Venkataraman ()] 'The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research'. S Shane , S Venkataraman
287 . *Academy of management review* 2000. 25 (1) p. .

288 [Rotundo and Sackett ()] 'The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to
289 global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach'. M Rotundo , P R Sackett . *Journal of applied
290 psychology* 2002. 87 (1) p. 66.

291 [Kanter ()] 'Three tiers for innovation research'. R M Kanter . *Communication Research* 1988. 15 (5) p. .

292 [Kleysen and Street ()] 'Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior'. R F Kleysen ,
293 C T Street . *Journal of intellectual Capital* 2001.

294 [Pisano ()] *Toward a prescriptive theory of dynamic capabilities: connecting strategic choice, learning, and
295 competition. Industrial and Corporate Change*, G P Pisano . 2017. 26 p. .

296 [Reuvers et al. ()] 'Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour: Exploring the relevance of gender
297 differences'. M Reuvers , M L Van Engen , C J Vinkenburg , E Wilson-Evered . *Creativity and Innovation
298 Management* 2008. 17 (3) p. .

299 [Ambrosini and Bowman ()] 'What are dynamic capabilities and are they a useful construct in strategic
300 management'. V Ambrosini , C Bowman . *International journal of management reviews* 2009. 11 (1) p.
301 .

302 [Vroom ()] *Work and motivation*, V H Vroom . 1964.