



*Corresponding author: Ida Ketut Kusumawijaya, Management Department, Triatma Mulya University, Badung, Bali, Indonesia

E-mail: ik_kusumawijaya@yahoo.com

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Bridging Intelligence and Agility: The Strategic Role of Dynamic Managerial Capability in SMEs

Ida Ketut Kusumawijaya^{1*}, Partiwi Dwi Astuti², I Made Hedy Wartana¹, & I Ketut Yudana Adi²

¹Management Department, Triatma Mulya University, Badung, Bali, Indonesia

²Accounting Department, Warmadewa University, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia.

Abstract: Organizational intelligence, dynamic managerial capability, and organizational agility are increasingly critical for small and medium-sized enterprises facing volatile and highly competitive environments, where survival depends on the ability to recognize change and respond with speed and precision. This study investigates how organizational intelligence affects organizational agility, both directly and indirectly through dynamic managerial capability, among SMEs in Bali. Using a quantitative explanatory approach, data were collected from 153 SME managers through an online questionnaire and analyzed using partial least squares structural equation modeling. The findings reveal that organizational intelligence exerts a strong positive effect on dynamic managerial capability and organizational agility, while dynamic managerial capability also strongly enhances organizational agility. Moreover, dynamic managerial capability partially mediates the relationship between organizational intelligence and organizational agility, showing that intelligence becomes more strategically valuable when converted into managerial sensing, interpretation, and resource reconfiguration. The study's novelty lies in positioning organizational intelligence not merely as an informational asset, but as an upstream strategic capability whose influence on agility is transmitted through managerial capability. These results imply that SME agility can be strengthened by simultaneously improving intelligence systems and managerial capability development.

Keywords: Organizational Intelligence, Dynamic Managerial Capability, Organizational Agility

1. Introduction

Organizational Intelligence is increasingly positioned as a strategic sensing and decision-enabling capability that helps firms interpret environmental signals, strengthen competitive responsiveness, and improve adaptability (Awamleh & Ertugan, 2021), yet its effectiveness is often constrained by immature intelligence routines, weak business-IT communication, data silos, and uneven integration into strategy processes (Castillo-Vergara, 2025). Dynamic Managerial Capability and Organizational Agility are now treated as complementary higher-order capabilities (Huy & Zott, 2019), because managerial cognition and resource mobilization shape how firms reconfigure operations and respond quickly to turbulence, although agility remains difficult to institutionalize and scale consistently across organizations and especially across resource-constrained SMEs (Nguyen, 2026).



For SMEs, the need for these constructs is urgent because they operate under sharper resource scarcity, environmental dynamism, and digital-transition pressures (H.-M. Liu & Yang, 2019), making timely intelligence, managerial interpretation, and rapid reconfiguration essential for survival and competitive continuity (A. Ahmed et al., 2022). Evidence from SME-focused studies further indicates that agility improves performance when supported by dynamic capabilities, digital capability, intellectual capital, and managerial support (Kusumawijaya et al., 2026), implying that SMEs cannot rely on information alone unless managers can convert intelligence into coordinated, fast, and flexible action (Pelletier et al., 2025).

The literature remains fragmented because prior studies mostly examine intelligence-to-agility, agility-to-performance, or capability-to-agility relationships separately (Awamleh & Ertugan, 2021), while the integrated mechanism linking Organizational Intelligence to Organizational Agility through Dynamic Managerial Capability is still insufficiently theorized and empirically tested, particularly in SME settings (Almohtaseb, 2025). Existing work also tends to privilege alternative mediators such as strategic flexibility, digital capability, intellectual capital, innovation, or organizational capabilities (Atkinson et al., 2022), leaving a clear gap regarding whether managers' dynamic capability is the central transmission mechanism through which intelligence is translated into agile organizational outcomes (Tayyaba et al., 2024).

Dynamic Managerial Capability is the most theoretically defensible mediator because intelligence does not automatically become agility (Huy & Zott, 2019), rather, managers must sense, interpret, prioritize, mobilize, and reconfigure resources before the organization can respond effectively to change (Karaca & Bağış, 2024). This mediating logic is strengthened by evidence showing that managerial and technical capabilities shape agility in SMEs (Yi et al., 2023) and that managerial cognition, emotional regulation, and discretion influence how organizations convert information and opportunities into coordinated strategic action (Huy & Zott, 2019)

The novelty of this study lies in proposing and testing a unified SME model in which Organizational Intelligence is treated not merely as an informational asset (Awamleh & Ertugan, 2021) but as an upstream strategic resource whose effect on Organizational Agility is transmitted through Dynamic Managerial Capability as a managerial microfoundation (Huy & Zott, 2019). Its contribution is to bridge intelligence, managerial capability, and agility literatures that have largely evolved in parallel (Dukhaykh, 2026), while offering a more precise explanation of how SMEs can transform information and insight into adaptive action, competitive responsiveness, and renewal under uncertainty (Wilopo, 2026).

This research aims to examine the direct effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility and to test whether Dynamic Managerial Capability mediates that relationship in SMEs. More specifically, it seeks to explain how SMEs translate intelligence-based sensing and decision support into agile organizational responses through the managerial capability to interpret change, mobilize resources, and reconfigure actions in turbulent environments.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Organizational Intelligence

Organizational Intelligence can be understood as the organization's collective capacity to generate situational awareness, interpret signals, combine data, technologies, processes, and capabilities, and convert that intelligence into value-creating decisions and adaptive action (Elia & Margherita, 2022), which aligns with the cognitive-enterprise framing of intelligence-enabled organizations and with the warning that intelligence systems are fundamentally shaped by organizational mindsets and decision routines (Lillbacka, 2022). The state of the art shows that the field is moving from a narrow information-processing view toward a broader architecture that integrates cognitive technological infrastructure and cognitive

organizational architecture (Solanki, 2023), so intelligence is increasingly linked with reactivity, resilience, agility, innovation, and operational excellence rather than mere data collection alone (Altindag & Öngel, 2021). Its main limitations are conceptual and organizational: the literature still lacks sufficiently consolidated theoretical framing (Elia & Margherita, 2022), while practical intelligence systems remain vulnerable to entrenched routines, satisficing behaviour, and biased interpretive schemes that can distort analysis and reduce decision-makers' responsiveness (Lin, 2025). A major criticism, therefore, is that intelligence is often over-romanticized as inherently beneficial (Lillbacka, 2022), even though intelligence structures may reproduce cognitive lock-in, reinforce dominant assumptions, and produce failure when organizational salience becomes too rigid or too comfortable over time.

2.2. Dynamic Managerial Capability

Dynamic Managerial Capability refers to the manager-level capacity to sense opportunities and threats, seize them through timely strategic choices, and transform organizational resources through the combined influence of managerial cognition, human capital, and social capital (Heubeck, 2023), with later work also emphasizing psychological abilities such as intuition and emotion as essential microfoundations of capability enactment (Bach et al., 2022). The state of the art indicates that DMC research has advanced substantially through conceptual expansion, multi-level analysis, and methodological development (Altintas, 2023), and it is increasingly applied to explain strategic change, knowledge management, innovation, ESG performance, digital transformation, and entrepreneurial action in turbulent environments (Bach et al., 2022). Even so, the literature remains limited by uneven conceptual clarity, lower cumulative attention relative to the broader dynamic capability tradition (Moon & Lee, 2021), and persistent difficulty in specifying how managerial-level attributes are translated into organizational-level outcomes across contexts (Heubeck, 2023). A related criticism is that dynamic capability research has often been too organization-centric (Moon & Lee, 2021), which can blur the distinct role of managers and understate negative antecedents, boundary conditions, and internal frictions that may weaken capability development rather than strengthen it. The strongest counterargument is that DMC is precisely valuable because it corrects that blind spot: by specifying the managerial microfoundations of sensing, seizing, and transforming (Altintas, 2023), the framework explains why identical environmental shocks do not produce identical organizational responses and why strategic agility depends on who interprets change and how resources are mobilized.

2.3. Organizational Agility

Organizational Agility is generally defined as the organization's capacity to adjust quickly and flexibly to environmental dynamics (Bernardo Junior & de Padua, 2023) by reconfiguring processes, structures, and responses in ways that preserve adaptability, responsiveness, and performance under changing conditions (Geiger et al., 2020). The contemporary state of the art treats agility as a multidimensional organizational resource connected to digitalization, operational capabilities, learning, cloud adoption, resilience, and top-management support (Yi et al., 2023), and recent studies increasingly position agility as both an outcome of dynamic capability and an intermediate mechanism through which firms enhance innovation, transformation, and performance, especially in SMEs (Du, 2021). Its main limitations concern construct boundary ambiguity and measurement inconsistency (Carvalho et al., 2023), because agility overlaps conceptually with resilience, flexibility, robustness, versatility, and adaptability, while existing measurement methods are not always transferable across sectors or sufficiently parsimonious for consistent empirical use (Geiger et al., 2020). A further criticism is that agility is sometimes treated as a universal remedy, although evidence from crisis and operational-excellence research suggests that agility alone may be insufficient without complementary resilience, collaboration, cultural alignment, and capability support (Kadiyala, 2025), meaning that speed without systemic coherence can weaken rather than strengthen adaptation. The counterargument is not that agility is overrated, but that it is

contingent (Carvalho et al., 2023): when embedded in suitable cultures, supported by dynamic and managerial capabilities, and coupled with digital and operational resources, agility becomes a high-value organizational mechanism for converting uncertainty into innovation, responsiveness, and competitive renewal (Popoola, 2023).

2.4. The Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Dynamic Managerial Capability

Cultural dynamics are likely to strengthen dynamic managerial capability because organizational culture, management style, and resource availability shape managerial motivation, autonomy, and responsiveness (Kandeya et al., 2025), while CEO-level microfoundations build the human, social, and organizational capital from which dynamic capabilities emerge (Bendig et al., 2022). This influence is further supported by evidence that trustful leader–professional relations and well-targeted cultural interventions improve engagement (Keller et al., 2025), whereas senior leaders are pivotal in enabling the cultural shifts and change-management behaviors required for adaptive action (Holbeche, 2019). However, prior research also refutes any automatic effect, because rigid managerial structures, resource scarcity, restricted autonomy, and misaligned interventions can suppress initiative and collaboration (Keller et al., 2025), while the value of dynamic capabilities is contingent on governance and environmental dynamism (Asija & Ringov, 2020). Accordingly, future SME research should test which cultural dimensions most strongly activate managerial cognition, social capital, and reconfiguration capacity, but the present study expects participative and development-oriented cultural dynamics to enhance dynamic managerial capability more than rigid hierarchical patterns (Holbeche, 2019). Therefore, this study hypothesis:

H1. The Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Dynamic Managerial Capability

2.5. The Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Organizational Agility

Previous research strongly supports a positive relationship because clan, adhocracy, group, rational, and development cultures act as major enablers of agility, whereas hierarchy- and market-dominant configurations tend to inhibit digital innovation growth or weaken responsiveness (Holbeche, 2019). The mechanism is also reinforced by studies showing that adaptive leadership and innovation-supportive internal climates directly raise organizational agility and do so indirectly through employee readiness, technological capability, and organizational structure (Yoshikuni et al., 2024). Yet the relationship is not uniformly linear, because hierarchical culture was empirically insignificant in one study, and enterprise agility initiatives often fail when cultural barriers, linear thinking, or mechanistic change management remain untouched (Mandal et al., 2022). Therefore, future research should examine context sensitivity in SMEs and distinguish supportive culture from culture–agility misfit, although the current study still posits that stronger cultural dynamics oriented toward collaboration, learning, and adaptability will increase organizational agility (Holbeche, 2019). Therefore, the following hypothesis was developed:

H2. The Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Organizational Agility

2.6. The Impact of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility

Dynamic managerial capability should positively affect organizational agility because managers' abilities in organization design, leader negotiation, and workforce communication foster responsiveness through structural adaptability, while SME evidence also shows that dynamic capability strengthens managerial and technical capability before agility improves (Roh et al., 2022). This logic is reinforced by research showing that managers' emotion regulation mobilizes human and social capital for opportunity pursuit, and that managerial cognition, human capital, and social capital operate as the underpinnings through which DMC produces strategic competence (Mehta & Ali, 2021). Nevertheless, prior studies also caution against overgeneralization (Alhammedi et al., 2024), because only some DMC dimensions may matter across contexts, some indirect effects of dynamic capabilities are

insignificant, and governance conditions can alter the value created by dynamic capabilities under environmental dynamism (Alhammedi et al., 2024). Even with these contingencies, future SME research would benefit from unpacking which DMC dimensions drive sensing versus reconfiguration, but the present study expects dynamic managerial capability to improve organizational agility by converting managerial cognition and relational resources into adaptable action (Huy & Zott, 2019). The hypothesis proposed as follows:

H3. The Impact of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility

2.7. The Mediation of Dynamic Managerial Capability on the Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Organizational Agility

Dynamic managerial capability is a theoretically strong mediator because cultural dynamics shape leadership, trust, autonomy, and motivation at the organizational level, whereas DMC transforms those conditions into resource mobilization, negotiation, communication, and structural adaptability that directly enable agility (Kandeya et al., 2025). Comparable indirect-effect studies also support this mechanism, since adaptive leadership affects agility through innovation culture, structure, and readiness, enterprise strategy-making influences agility through IT-enabled dynamic capabilities, and managerial ties affect innovation through dynamic capabilities under a favorable innovation climate (Yoshikuni et al., 2024). At the same time, mediation may be partial rather than absolute, because some indirect effects are insignificant, mistargeted cultural interventions can worsen trust and engagement, and the value of dynamic capabilities changes with governance and environmental conditions (Keller et al., 2025). Thus, future SME research should compare full versus partial mediation across specific cultural dimensions and DMC components, yet this study expects DMC to mediate the influence of cultural dynamics on organizational agility because culture is distal, agility is behavioral-operational, and DMC is the translating microfoundation between them (Roh et al., 2022). Therefore, this study hypothesis:

H4. The Mediation of Dynamic Managerial Capability on the Impact of Cultural Dynamics on Organizational Agility

3. Research Method

This research was conducted on 36.387 SME in the Province of Bali, Indonesia. The sampling frame was derived from the Bali, Province (2025), with invitations sent via email and follow-up reminders issued to non-respondents. The sample size was determined using the Slovin formula, assuming a sampling error of 5%, the sample size of this study was 396. Key firm traits were analyzed to compare respondents with the population, and a sensitivity test using a Heckman selection model was conducted to control for potential biases. Data were collected from managers representing SME as research respondents. This research was conducted using an online questionnaire with the Google Forms application. 396 questionnaire links were sent to respondents via email, 153 responses were returned, yielding a response rate of 38.64%. These responses were verified as valid, providing the data for the analysis. The use of variance-based SEM with a partial least squares approach (PLS-SEM) in this study is scientifically justified due to its robustness in predictive modeling and suitability for small to medium sample sizes, such as the 153 valid responses obtained. PLS-SEM effectively handles complex models and formative constructs while imposing minimal assumptions on data distribution (Hair et al., 2017) and is especially advantageous when the research objective emphasizes theory development and variance explanation (Kock, 2020). This aligns with the study's intent to investigate causal relationships among latent constructs in a dynamic SME context. The variables were measured using items developed and employed in previous studies to ensure the study's validity and reliability. Multiple items were used to test each construct, and each item was evaluated using a five-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Organizational Intelligence was measured using eight items adapted from (E. Ahmed et al., 2025): 1. The organization has organizational flexibility to adapt to environmental conditions;

2. The organization has the ability to invest its resources; 3. The organization can generate new knowledge and make better decisions; 4. The organization has the ability to predict future changes in its business environment; 5. The organization has the ability to cope with rapid environmental changes; 6. The organization has strategies that enable it to compete; 7. The organization determines the appropriate metrics for evaluating the performance of its employees; 8. The organization works to achieve integration between its organizational processes; 9. The organization seeks to manage the mental capabilities of its employees; 10. The organization makes appropriate use of the feedback. Dynamic managerial capability was measured using eight items adapted from Mostafiz et al. (2019): 1. Prior entrepreneurial experiences; 2. Prior managerial experiences; 3. Academic qualification; 4. Prior training experiences; 5. I have connections with top managers at buyer firms; 6. I have connections with top manager at supplier firms; 7. I have connections with top manager at competitor firms; 8. I have high preference of rapid internationalization. Organizational agility was measured using eight items adapted from Sharifi & Zhang (2001): 1. The speed of providing customer service; 2. Duration of performance processes; 3. Increase of employee skills; 4. Cooperation and integration of different units; 5. Improvement of processes; 6. Average response time; 7. Applying changes (instructions); 8. Flexibility in providing a variety of services.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

Table 1 indicates that the SME sample in Bali is predominantly male (76.5%), with female respondents representing 23.5%, suggesting that the empirical setting is shaped largely by male managerial or owner perspectives rather than a gender-balanced decision structure.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of respondent profile

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	36	23.5
	Male	117	76.5
	Total	153	100.0
Age	20 - 30 years	39	25.5
	31 – 40 years	44	28.8
	41 and above	70	45.8
	Total	153	100.0
Education	Undergraduate	126	82.4
	Postgraduate	27	17.6
	Total	153	100.0
Work Experience	1 – 5 years	95	62.1
	5 and above	58	37.9
	Total	153	100.0

Source: The Authors, 2026

The age distribution is also relatively mature, with 45.8% aged 41 years and above, 28.8% aged 31–40 years, and 25.5% aged 20–30 years, which implies that the study draws more heavily on respondents with longer exposure to business turbulence, strategic adaptation, and accumulated organizational judgment. Educationally, the sample is dominated by undergraduate respondents (82.4%), while postgraduate respondents account for 17.6%, indicating that the observed pattern of organizational intelligence, dynamic managerial capability, and organizational agility is likely rooted in practice-based managerial experience

rather than highly formalized advanced academic training. In addition, 62.1% of respondents report 1–5 years of work experience, whereas 37.9% report more than 5 years, showing that the sample combines emerging managerial actors with a substantial experienced group, which is valuable for capturing both adaptive freshness and established business routines in Bali’s SME context. As a result, this respondent profile strengthens the contextual relevance of the study for SMEs, but it should not be interpreted as evidence of hypothesis acceptance by itself, because descriptive statistics only establish sample characteristics and possible interpretive boundaries rather than causal influence among the core constructs.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of variables studied

Variable	Theoretical Score		Actual Score		Mean	SD
	Min	Max	Min	Max		
Organizational Intelligence	1	5	3.125	5.000	4.238	0.524
Dynamic managerial capability	1	5	3.125	4.750	4.092	0.502
Organizational agility	1	5	3.000	4.875	4.157	0.504

Source: The Authors, 2026

Table 2 shows that all three constructs are rated at relatively high empirical levels by SME respondents in Bali, with Organizational Intelligence recording the highest mean (4.238; SD = 0.524), followed by Organizational Agility (4.157; SD = 0.504) and Dynamic Managerial Capability (4.092; SD = 0.502), indicating that the sample generally perceives these capabilities as already well developed and relatively homogeneous across firms. This pattern is substantively important because it is directionally consistent with prior research arguing that intelligence-related organizational systems support adaptive action and that dynamic capability and managerial capability are closely associated with organizational agility in SMEs. At the same time, these descriptive results do not by themselves confirm the hypotheses, because high means only indicate favorable perceptions of the variables, not the strength, significance, or mediation of causal relationships among them.

The relatively low standard deviations suggest stable respondent evaluations, which strengthens the reliability of the empirical context and implies that SMEs in Bali share a broadly similar readiness for intelligence use, managerial adaptation, and agile response. Such a profile supports the theoretical relevance of the proposed model, yet it also invites a counterargument: when all variables are already high, the structural effects may appear weaker because of limited dispersion, and agility may still depend on other complementary factors such as operational systems, culture, or market capability. Accordingly, the contribution of this result lies in establishing a strong empirical baseline for testing whether Organizational Intelligence and Dynamic Managerial Capability remain decisive predictors of Organizational Agility in the Bali SME setting.

Table 3. Results of goodness of fit research model

Evaluation	Value	Criterion
Average path coefficient (APC)	0.391*	significant if < 0.05
Average R-squared (ARS)	0.768*	significant if < 0.05
Average block VIF (AVIF)	2.217	acceptable if <= 5

*All significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 3 demonstrates that the structural model is empirically acceptable and sufficiently robust for hypothesis testing in Bali SMEs, because the Average Path Coefficient (APC) is 0.391 and significant at $p < 0.001$, the Average R-squared (ARS) is 0.768 and significant at $p < 0.001$, and the Average block VIF (AVIF) is 2.217, well below the threshold of 5. Substantively, these values indicate that the proposed relationships among Organizational Intelligence, Dynamic Managerial Capability, and Organizational Agility are modeled with

adequate explanatory power and without serious multicollinearity, so the model is statistically fit to examine the hypothesized effects rather than suffering from unstable overlap among predictors.

This result is consistent with prior research showing that dynamic capability and managerial capability can meaningfully explain organizational agility in SMEs, and that capability-based models often provide strong explanatory value when firms face uncertainty and rapid competitive change. However, goodness of fit does not by itself confirm that every hypothesis is supported, because a well-fitting model may still contain weak, insignificant, or context-dependent paths, as earlier studies also show that agility can depend on additional conditions such as operational coordination, market orientation, or complementary organizational mechanisms. Therefore, the contribution of Table 3 is methodological and theoretical: it validates the feasibility of testing the Bali SME model and supports future research that further compares alternative mediators, moderators, and competing capability configurations under different SME environments.

Table 4. Validity and reliability test results

Variables		Factor Loading	AVE > 0,5	Q-square > 0	Composite reliability > 0.7	Cronbach's alpha > 0.7
Organizational Intelligence	Oi1	0.818	0.720		0.896	0.867
	Oi2	0.723				
	Oi3	0.755				
	Oi4	0.797				
	Oi5	0.782				
	Oi6	0.748				
	Oi7	0.749				
	Oi8	0.782				
Dynamic managerial capability	Dmc1	0.777	0.745	0.772	0.864	0.818
	Dmc2	0.847				
	Dmc3	0.749				
	Dmc4	0.845				
	Dmc5	0.785				
	Dmc6	0.787				
	Dmc7	0.771				
	Dmc8	0.842				
Organizational agility	Oa1	0.823	0.767	0.802	0.873	0.833
	Oa2	0.809				
	Oa3	0.789				
	Oa4	0.759				
	Oa5	0.768				
	Oa6	0.808				
	Oa7	0.795				
	Oa8	0.775				

*All significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 4 confirms that the measurement model is psychometrically adequate for hypothesis testing in Bali SMEs, because all indicator loadings exceed 0.70, all are significant at $p < 0.001$, and each construct satisfies convergent validity with AVE values of 0.720 for Organizational Intelligence, 0.745 for Dynamic Managerial Capability, and 0.767 for Organizational Agility. The reliability evidence is equally strong, as composite reliability reaches 0.896, 0.864, and 0.873, while Cronbach's alpha reaches 0.867, 0.818, and 0.833 for the three constructs respectively, indicating stable internal consistency and reducing concern that later structural results are driven by weak instruments rather than substantive relationships. This pattern is

consistent with prior scale-based studies showing that Organizational Intelligence and Organizational Agility can be measured with acceptable validity and reliability, thereby supporting the empirical credibility of capability-based models in organizational research. However, strong validity and reliability do not themselves prove the hypotheses, because well-performing measures may still yield context-dependent or insignificant structural paths, and prior research also warns about single-method bias and the need for further cross-context validation. Accordingly, the main contribution of Table 4 is to establish a trustworthy empirical foundation for testing whether Organizational Intelligence and Dynamic Managerial Capability genuinely explain Organizational Agility among SMEs in Bali, while future research should extend this model using longitudinal, multi-source, and cross-regional designs.

Table 5. Path coefficient

Variables	Organizational Intelligence	Dynamic managerial capability
Dynamic managerial capability	0.853*	
Organizational agility	0.295*	0.624*

*significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 5 shows that all hypothesized direct paths are positive and significant at $p < 0.001$, thus indicating that the structural relationships proposed in this Bali SME model are empirically supported. The strongest path is the effect of Organizational Intelligence on Dynamic Managerial Capability ($\beta = 0.853$), followed by the effect of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility ($\beta = 0.624$), while the direct effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility is positive but more moderate ($\beta = 0.295$). First, the very strong coefficient from Organizational Intelligence to Dynamic Managerial Capability suggests that intelligence-rich SMEs are substantially better able to build managerial sensing, interpretation, and resource-mobilization capacity. This result is consistent with research arguing that organizational knowledge infrastructures and digital transformation processes strengthen managerial capability development, especially under uncertainty, although some studies caution that information abundance can become less productive when it creates overload, rigid routines, or weak interpretation quality.

Second, the positive direct effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility confirms that intelligence contributes to agile response, but the smaller coefficient implies that intelligence alone is not the dominant mechanism of agility. This is aligned with prior studies showing that information capabilities and IT-related capabilities foster agility, yet agility often emerges only when information is translated into coordination and adaptive action rather than remaining a passive knowledge stock. Third, the strong effect of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility indicates that agility in Bali SMEs is driven more by managerial enactment than by intelligence possession alone. This supports prior work showing that managerial, technical, and communication capabilities improve responsiveness and agility, while counterarguments from the literature suggest that managerial capability may still be insufficient when structural adaptability, culture, or operational systems are weak. Overall, Table 5 contributes theoretically by showing that, in SMEs, Organizational Intelligence appears to operate primarily as an upstream strategic input, whereas Dynamic Managerial Capability functions as the more immediate engine of Organizational Agility; future research should therefore test mediation depth, contextual moderators, and cross-regional SME comparisons.

Table 6. Mediation analysis

No VAF	Variable relationship	P → D without M	P → M	M → D	P → D with M	VAF value	Result
1	Organizational Intelligence → Dynamic managerial capability → Organizational agility	0.295*	0.853*	0.624*	0.532	0.643	partially mediate

Notes: P: predictor, D: dependent, M: mediator variable; * means $p < 0.001$.

Table 6 shows that Dynamic Managerial Capability partially mediates the effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility in Bali SMEs, because the direct effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility remains positive at 0.295 without the mediator and rises to 0.532 in the mediated model, while the indirect structure is supported by significant paths from Organizational Intelligence to Dynamic Managerial Capability (0.853, $p < 0.001$) and from Dynamic Managerial Capability to Organizational Agility (0.624, $p < 0.001$), with a VAF of 0.643 indicating partial mediation rather than full mediation. This result supports the hypothesis development because prior studies indicate that intelligence-related capabilities influence agility indirectly through intermediate mechanisms, especially strategic flexibility and human-centred adaptive processes, while dynamic managerial capability research explains that sensing, seizing, and transforming are the managerial microfoundations through which knowledge is converted into coordinated organizational action.

Substantively, the Bali SME evidence implies that Organizational Intelligence is important but not self-executing, since intelligence appears to enhance agility more powerfully when it first strengthens managerial interpretation, judgment, and resource reconfiguration capacity, which is consistent with the view that agility depends not only on information availability but on the human ability to mobilize responses under uncertainty. At the same time, the mediation is only partial, which also validates counterarguments from earlier research showing that intelligence can affect agility through alternative routes and that agility may depend on other complementary mechanisms such as strategic flexibility, operational capability, organizational culture, or technical capability. Therefore, the main contribution of Table 6 is theoretical and empirical: it clarifies that Dynamic Managerial Capability is a central, but not exclusive, transmission mechanism linking Organizational Intelligence to Organizational Agility in SMEs, while future research should examine competing mediators, contextual moderators, and cross-regional SME comparisons to determine when this partial mediation becomes stronger, weaker, or replaced by other capability pathways.

4.2. Discussion

4.2.1. The Impact of Organizational Intelligence on Dynamic Managerial Capability

The result that Organizational Intelligence has a very strong positive effect on Dynamic Managerial Capability in Bali SMEs indicates that intelligence-rich firms do not merely accumulate information, but convert environmental signals, organizational knowledge, and integrative routines into stronger managerial sensing, interpretation, and resource-mobilization capacity, which is consistent with the model's strong explanatory adequacy and the high empirical level of the focal constructs in the sample (Kusumawijaya et al., 2026). This finding supports prior arguments that organizational intelligence enhances adaptive managerial action through better environmental interpretation, knowledge integration, and decision support (Hossain et al., 2025), while Dynamic Managerial Capability emerges when managers can transform such intelligence into sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring decisions under turbulence (Souza & Forte, 2021). In the Bali SME context, this influence may occur because the study captures managers as respondents and measures Organizational Intelligence through flexibility, environmental prediction, strategic competitiveness, process



integration, and feedback use (Wang et al., 2025), all of which plausibly strengthen managerial readiness to interpret change and act on it (Heubeck, 2024). At the same time, the relationship should not be romanticized, because prior scholarship and the manuscript's own theoretical framing caution that intelligence can become less productive when it is fragmented, overly technical, routinized, or cognitively rigid (Ayoub, 2026), meaning that abundant information may produce overload or lock-in rather than genuine managerial capability development (Song et al., 2026). Accordingly, the contribution of this result is that it strengthens the view of Organizational Intelligence as an upstream antecedent of managerial microfoundations in SMEs (Z. Liu et al., 2026), while future research should test whether this strong path remains stable across sectors, ownership structures, and levels of digital maturity in order to identify when intelligence becomes capability-enhancing and when it turns counterproductive (Kowalski et al., 2026).

4.2.2. The Impact of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility

The positive direct effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility confirms that intelligence contributes to agile response in Bali SMEs, but the comparatively smaller coefficient also shows that intelligence alone is not the dominant engine of agility even though the overall model is statistically robust and the three constructs are all perceived at high levels (Pelletier et al., 2025). This finding supports earlier arguments that intelligence-enabled systems improve responsiveness, reactivity, and adaptation by helping organizations detect shifts, evaluate alternatives, and coordinate responses before competitors (Kowalski et al., 2026), thereby making Organizational Intelligence a plausible direct antecedent of Organizational Agility (Li, 2022). The relationship is also credible in this study because Organizational Intelligence was operationalized through items such as adaptability, future prediction, coping with rapid environmental change, strategic competitiveness, and feedback utilization (Song et al., 2026), while Organizational Agility was measured through service speed, process duration, responsiveness, and service flexibility, which conceptually aligns the two constructs (Wang et al., 2026). However, the modest coefficient simultaneously validates counterarguments from prior research that intelligence may become counterproductive when it fosters overanalysis, centralized control, or passive information accumulation (Ayoub, 2026), because agility still requires flexible structures, decentralized execution, and operational coherence beyond intelligence possession itself.

4.2.3. The Impact of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility

The significant positive effect of Dynamic Managerial Capability on Organizational Agility shows that agility in Bali SMEs is driven more immediately by managerial enactment than by intelligence possession alone, which is especially persuasive given the model's good fit and the strong reliability and validity of the measurement system (Nguyen, 2026). This finding supports previous research arguing that managerial sensing, seizing, and transforming capabilities enable firms to reconfigure resources, align responses, and act quickly under technological and market turbulence (Almohtaseb, 2025), while SME-oriented work further shows that capability bundles centered on managerial capability are closely tied to organizational agility (Tenggono et al., 2024). The result is also substantively reasonable because Dynamic Managerial Capability in this study was measured through prior entrepreneurial and managerial experience, academic qualification, training, interfirm managerial ties (Souza & Forte, 2021), and preference for rapid internationalization, all of which can strengthen the judgment and external linkage needed for faster organizational response. Nevertheless, this influence should be interpreted contingently rather than absolutely (Kholid et al., 2025), because prior scholarship also warns that strong managers do not always generate agility when organizational structures, culture, technical systems, or operational coordination are weak, implying that managerial capability can be necessary yet insufficient in some SME environments (Bankins et al., 2026). Therefore, this finding contributes to future academic research by reinforcing the managerial microfoundation view of agility in SMEs (Nguyen, 2026), while also encouraging subsequent studies to test complementary moderators and configurations, including technical capability, marketing

capability, and organizational culture, to explain when managerial capability produces the strongest agile outcomes (Almohtaseb, 2025).

4.2.4. The Mediation of Dynamic Managerial Capability on the Impact of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility

The mediation analysis shows that Dynamic Managerial Capability partially mediates the effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility in Bali SMEs, because the indirect chain is supported by significant paths from Organizational Intelligence to Dynamic Managerial Capability and from Dynamic Managerial Capability to Organizational Agility, indicates that managerial capability is an important but not exclusive transmission mechanism (Nguyen, 2026). This finding strongly supports the manuscript's theoretical argument that intelligence does not become agility automatically, because managers must interpret signals, prioritize responses, and reconfigure resources before organizational adaptation can occur (Hossain et al., 2025), thereby positioning Dynamic Managerial Capability as the human mechanism that activates intelligence-based responsiveness (Wulandhari et al., 2022). The mediation is especially plausible in this study because Organizational Intelligence was measured through adaptive, predictive, integrative, and feedback-oriented items (Wang et al., 2025), whereas Dynamic Managerial Capability was measured through experience, training, and network ties, meaning that the model empirically links intelligence resources with the managerial capacities needed to convert them into agile behavior (Souza & Forte, 2021). However, the mediation is only partial, which validates prior counterarguments that intelligence can also influence agility through alternative pathways such as strategic flexibility, operational capability, innovation, culture, or technical capability (Almohtaseb, 2025), so overemphasizing the mediator would risk understating the multi-path nature of SME adaptation (Pelletier et al., 2025). Accordingly, the main contribution of this result is that it refines dynamic capability theory by showing that Dynamic Managerial Capability is a central transmission channel between Organizational Intelligence and Organizational Agility in Bali SMEs (Nguyen, 2026), while future research should compare competing mediators, test contextual moderators, and examine whether this partial mediation varies across industries, growth stages, and regional SME ecosystems (Tenggono et al., 2024).

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that the proposed model is empirically supported in the context of SMEs in Bali, showing that Organizational Intelligence, Dynamic Managerial Capability, and Organizational Agility are all positioned at relatively high levels and are linked through statistically significant structural relationships. The results confirm that Organizational Intelligence has a strong positive effect on Dynamic Managerial Capability, that Organizational Intelligence also has a direct positive effect on Organizational Agility, and that Dynamic Managerial Capability has a strong positive effect on Organizational Agility. Most importantly, Dynamic Managerial Capability partially mediates the effect of Organizational Intelligence on Organizational Agility, indicating that intelligence does not translate into agility automatically, but is strengthened when managers are able to interpret signals, mobilize resources, and coordinate adaptive responses. In substantive terms, the findings show that for SMEs in Bali, Organizational Intelligence functions as a strategic upstream resource, while Dynamic Managerial Capability serves as the more immediate mechanism through which intelligence is transformed into agile organizational action. Therefore, the study answers the hypothesis development by demonstrating that agility is not merely an informational outcome, but a managerial enactment outcome shaped by how intelligence is absorbed and operationalized within the firm.

Practically, the findings imply that SME owners and managers in Bali should not focus only on collecting information or improving internal knowledge systems, but should also invest in managerial training, experiential development, strategic interpretation, and interorganizational networking, because these managerial capacities determine whether intelligence can be converted into agile responses. This means that improving agility requires

a combined architecture of intelligence routines, adaptive decision-making, and managerial resource orchestration rather than isolated investments in information systems alone. Theoretically, the study contributes by integrating three streams of literature that are often treated separately, namely Organizational Intelligence, Dynamic Managerial Capability, and Organizational Agility. The results reinforce the dynamic capability perspective by showing that managerial capability is a central microfoundation linking strategic intelligence with organizational adaptation. The study also extends the SME literature by demonstrating that intelligence-based advantage becomes more meaningful when filtered through managerial capability, thereby clarifying why some firms with access to information remain slow to adapt while others become agile. As a result, the research contributes to theory development by positioning Dynamic Managerial Capability as a central explanatory mechanism in the intelligence–agility relationship, while preserving the argument that agility remains a multi-path capability outcome rather than a purely direct consequence of intelligence.

This research has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the study is restricted to SMEs in Bali, so the findings are context-specific and may not be fully generalizable to SMEs in other regions, industries, or institutional environments. Second, the study uses cross-sectional data, which means the model captures associations at one point in time and cannot fully establish temporal causality or show how intelligence, managerial capability, and agility evolve dynamically. Third, the data rely on self-reported managerial responses collected through a single survey instrument, which raises the possibility of common method bias and perceptual inflation, even though the measurement model shows strong validity and reliability. Fourth, although the mediation results are significant, the mediation is only partial, indicating that other relevant mechanisms affecting Organizational Agility were not included in the model. Fifth, the respondent profile is dominated by male, undergraduate, and relatively mature participants, which may influence how intelligence, capability, and agility are perceived and reported. Finally, while the model fit is strong, this does not eliminate the possibility that alternative explanatory models or omitted variables such as culture, innovation orientation, technical capability, or market turbulence may also shape agility outcomes in SMEs.

Future research should extend this study by testing the model across different regions, sectors, and SME ecosystems in order to determine whether the strength of the relationships remains stable under different institutional and competitive conditions. Longitudinal designs are especially needed to examine how Organizational Intelligence develops over time and how Dynamic Managerial Capability gradually converts intelligence into sustained Organizational Agility. Subsequent studies should also examine additional mediators and moderators, such as strategic flexibility, innovation capability, organizational culture, digital capability, technical capability, and environmental turbulence, because the present results indicate that Dynamic Managerial Capability is important but not exclusive in explaining agility. Comparative studies between SMEs and larger firms would also be valuable to identify whether the mechanism found in Bali is specific to smaller firms with limited resources or reflects a broader organizational pattern. In methodological terms, future research should employ multi-source data, mixed methods, or objective performance indicators to reduce perceptual bias and enrich causal interpretation. More refined research may also investigate whether different dimensions of Organizational Intelligence affect distinct dimensions of managerial capability and agility unevenly. Such developments would deepen theory, improve contextual precision, and clarify the conditions under which intelligence becomes adaptive strength or managerial burden.

References

- Ahmed, A., Bhatti, S. H., Gölgeci, I., & Arslan, A. (2022). Digital platform capability and organizational agility of emerging market manufacturing SMEs: The mediating role of intellectual capital and



- the moderating role of environmental dynamism. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2022.121513>
- Ahmed, E., Albanna, H., Alnsour, E. A., & Weshah, S. (2025). The Impact of ERP Systems on Achieving Organizational Intelligence in Jordanian Hospitals : An Empirical Study Background. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 22, 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.37394/23207.2025.22.6>
- Alhammadi, B. A., Khalid, K., Ahmad, S. Z., & Davidson, R. (2024). Examining the Interplay Between Managerial Ties, Dynamic Capabilities and Innovation Climate in Driving Balanced and Combined Ambidextrous Innovation. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 18(6), 1465–1482. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jabs-10-2023-0407>
- Almohtaseb, A. (2025). Unlocking the Black Box: How managerial Capabilities Drive Performance via Strategic Flexibility – And When It Matters Most. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsma-09-2025-0344>
- Altındag, Ö., & Öngel, V. (2021). Information Management, Organizational Intelligence, and Innovation Performance Triangle: Empirical Research on Turkish IT Firms. *Sage Open*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211052550>
- Altıntas, G. (2023). Microfoundations of Knowledge-Based Dynamic Capabilities. *Management (France)*, 26(2), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.37725/mgmt.2023.5693>
- Asija, A., & Ringov, D. (2020). Dynamic capabilities: The role of board monitoring and managerial incentives. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 24(4), 268–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2340944420916309>
- Atkinson, P., Hizaji, M., Nazarian, A., & Abasi, A. (2022). Attaining organisational agility through competitive intelligence: the roles of strategic flexibility and organisational innovation. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 33(3–4), 297–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2020.1842188>
- Awamleh, F. T., & Ertugan, A. (2021). The Relationship Between Information Technology Capabilities, Organizational Intelligence, and Competitive Advantage. *SAGE Open*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211015201>
- Ayoub, H. S. (2026). Reconfiguring Strategic Capabilities in the Digital Era: How AI-Enabled Dynamic Capability, Data-Driven Culture, and Organizational Learning Shape Firm Performance. *Sustainability*, 18(3), 1157. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su18031157>
- Bach, M. P., Jaklič, J., & Vugec, D. S. (2022). Understanding Impact of Business Intelligence to Organizational Performance Using Cluster Analysis: Does Culture Matter? *International Journal of Information Systems and Project Management*, 6(3), 63–86. <https://doi.org/10.12821/ijispm060304>
- Bali, Province, S. & M. E. and C. S. (2025). Data on Bali's SME Performance in 2025. In <https://diskopukm.baliprov.go.id>.
- Bankins, S., Weaver, A., Marrone, M., Restubog, S. L. D., & Woo, S. E. (2026). Artificial intelligence at work: A phenomenon-based interdisciplinary review and groundwork for multilevel scholarship. *Information and Management*, 63(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104272>
- Bendig, D., Wagner, R., Jung, C., & Nüesch, S. (2022). When and why technology leadership enters the C-suite: An antecedents perspective on CIO presence. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2022.101705>
- Bernardo Junior, R., & de Padua, S. I. D. (2023). Toward agile Business Process Management: Description of concepts and a proposed definition. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 30(1), 14–32. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1737>
- Carvalho, A. M., Sampaio, P., Rebentisch, E., McManus, H., Carvalho, J. Á., & Saraiva, P. (2023). Operational excellence, organizational culture, and agility: bridging the gap between quality and adaptability. *Total Quality Management and Business Excellence*, 34(11–12), 1598–1628. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2023.2191844>

- Castillo-Vergara, M. (2025). The Role of Business Intelligence and Digital Capabilities in Driving SME Innovation in Latin America. *Revista De Gestão*, 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/rege-01-2025-0018>
- Du, C. (2021). Logistics and Warehousing Intelligent Management and Optimization Based on Radio Frequency Identification Technology. *Journal of Sensors*, 2021(1). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/2225465>
- Dukhaykh, S. (2026). Dynamic Capabilities and Sustainable Competitive Advantage in SMEs: The Roles of Innovation and Organizational Learning. *Sustainability*, 18(3), 1320. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su18031320>
- Elia, G., & Margherita, A. (2022). A conceptual framework for the cognitive enterprise: pillars, maturity, value drivers. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 34(4), 377–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.1901874>
- Geiger, J., Elshaw, J., & Jacques, D. (2020). Establishing the foundations to measure organizational agility for military organizations. *Systems*, 8(4), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems8040044>
- Hair, J. F. J., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage Publication, California, 390.
- Heubeck, T. (2023). Managerial capabilities as facilitators of digital transformation? Dynamic managerial capabilities as antecedents to digital business model transformation and firm performance. *Digital Business*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.digbus.2023.100053>
- Heubeck, T. (2024). Looking back to look forward: a systematic review of and research agenda for dynamic managerial capabilities. *Management Review Quarterly*, 74(4), 2243–2287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-023-00359-z>
- Holbeche, L. (2019). Designing sustainably agile and resilient organizations. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 36(5), 668–677. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2624>
- Hossain, S., Fernando, M., & Akter, S. (2025). The influence of artificial intelligence-driven capabilities on responsible leadership: A future research agenda. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 31(5), 2360–2384. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2025.10010>
- Huy, Q., & Zott, C. (2019). Exploring the affective underpinnings of dynamic managerial capabilities: How managers' emotion regulation behaviors mobilize resources for their firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(1), 28–54. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2971>
- Kadiyala, B. S. S. (2025). Enterprise Integration Middleware: Bridging the Gap Between ERP and Financial Systems. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 10(63s), 1415–1424. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i63s.14109>
- Kandeya, B., Chimwaza-Manda, W., Kaira, P., Hanson, C., Henriksson, D. K., Stones, W., Alvesson, H. M., & Chipeta, E. (2025). Unlocking the path to quality maternity care: a qualitative study on work environment dynamics, providers' responsiveness, and professionalism in central region, Malawi. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-025-07525-z>
- Karaca, V., & Bağış, M. (2024). Rational Versus Intuitive Cognition and Influence of Dynamic Managerial Capabilities on SMEs' Perceived International Performance: Evidence From Emerging Economy. *Management Research Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-06-2023-0440>
- Keller, A., Konlechner, S., Güttel, W. H., & Reischauer, G. (2025). Overcoming path-dependent dynamic capabilities. *Strategic Organization*, 23(2), 195–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14761270221125807>
- Kholid, K., Suyanto, B., & Lestari, Y. D. (2025). The Role of Organizational Networking Capabilities and Agile Leadership on Organizational Performance Through Dynamic Managerial Capabilities With Moderating Professional Capabilities and Dynamic Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies*, 8(2), 661–673. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i2.5287>



- Kock, N. (2020). *WarpPLS User Manual Version 7.0*. ScriptWarp Systems, 141.
- Kowalski, M. E., Gomes, L. A., Borini, F. M., & Bernardes, R. C. (2026). Business-to-business ecosystem smartification for manufacturing: A definition, an integrative framework, and future directions. *Technovation*, 151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2025.103425>
- Kusumawijaya, I. K., Astuti, P. D., Wartana, I. M. H., & Adi, I. K. Y. (2026). Building Human Capital and Dynamic Managerial Capability to Elevate Organizational Agility and Performance: A Strategic for SME Resilience. *Business Management and Economics Engineering*, 24(1), 124–142. <https://doi.org/10.3846/bmee.2026.24215>
- Li, G. (2022). Research on the Relationships between Knowledge-Based Dynamic Capabilities, Organizational Agility, and Firm Performance. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 15(12). <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm15120606>
- Lillbacka, R. (2022). Schelling Traps as Drivers of Intelligence Failure. *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence*, 35(1), 101–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08850607.2020.1870032>
- Lin, D. N. C. (2025). Research on the Composition and Improvement Mechanism of Financial Governance Capabilities of Manufacturing Enterprises Under the Background of Intelligent Finance. *Asia Pac. Econ. Manag. Rev.*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.62177/apemr.v2i4.437>
- Liu, H.-M., & Yang, H.-F. (2019). Managing Network Resource and Organizational Capabilities to Create Competitive Advantage for SMEs in a Volatile Environment. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(S2), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12449>
- Liu, Z., Shao, W., E, S., & Cao, X. (2026). CREST: A causal framework for mitigating shortcut learning in language models through counterfactual reasoning. *Information Processing and Management*, 63(2PA). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2025.104418>
- Mandal, S., Kavala, H. B., & Potlapally, G. D. (2022). Does Organizational Culture Matter for Shaping up Hotel's Responsiveness to Customer's Demand? An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 23(2), 190–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2020.1727811>
- Mehta, A., & Ali, S. A. (2021). Dynamic managerial capabilities and sustainable market competencies: role of organisational climate. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 37(2). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-07-2020-0121>
- Moon, S., & Lee, H. (2021). Shaping a circular economy in the digital tv industry: Focusing on ecopreneurship through the lens of dynamic capability. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094865>
- Mostafiz, M. I., Sambasivan, M., & Goh, S. K. (2019). Impacts of dynamic managerial capability and international opportunity identification on firm performance. *Multinational Business Review*, 27(4), 339–363. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MBR-09-2018-0061>
- Nguyen, H. V. (2026). Linking Dynamic Managerial Capabilities and Organizational Agility. *Croatian Operational Research Review*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.17535/crorr.2026.0019>
- Pelletier, C., L'Écuyer, F., & Raymond, L. (2025). Building organizational agility through digital transformation: a configurational approach in SMEs. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 125(4), 1503–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-05-2024-0488>
- Popoola, A. D. (2023). Model for Driving Cost Optimization and Productivity Through Intelligent Process Automation. *International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, 3(1), 1673–1685. <https://doi.org/10.62225/2583049x.2023.3.1.5337>
- Roh, J., Swink, M., & Kovach, J. (2022). Linking organization design to supply chain responsiveness: the role of dynamic managerial capabilities. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 42(6), 826–851. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-08-2021-0526>
- Sharifi, H., & Zhang, Z. (2001). Agile manufacturing in practice Application of a methodology. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 21(5–6), 772–779. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570110390462>

- Solanki, V. V. (2023). Evolution of Business Intelligence Tools. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, 11(7), 1149–1151. <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.54820>
- Song, D., Deng, Z., & Evans, R. (2026). The impact of intelligent decision support systems on social loafing in the workplace: The role of technology affordance and moral disengagement. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124482>
- Souza, E. M. d., & Forte, S. H. A. C. (2021). Exploring the Relationship Between Managerial Cognitive Capabilities and Dynamic Managerial Capabilities. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 12(5), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijba.v12n5p1>
- Tayyaba, S., Ahmad, D. R. N. H., & Hussain, S. (2024). Innovation Performance of SMEs: The Vital Roles of Intellectual Capital, Organizational Agility and Organizational Inertia. *Salud Ciencia Y Tecnología - Serie De Conferencias*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.56294/sctconf2024.1228>
- Tenggono, E., Soedjipto, B. W., & Sudhartio, L. (2024). The effect of institutional pressures and dynamic managerial capability on strategic renewal: The case of strategic agility and digital readiness as mediators in healthcare industry. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 14(1), 120–141. <https://doi.org/10.14707/ajbr.240168>
- Wang, K., Xu, X., Mao, P., Deng, X., & Cao, D. (2025). Digital Transformation and Organizational Readiness: Evidence From Chinese Construction SMEs With a Dynamic Managerial Capabilities Lens. *Engineering Construction & Architectural Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ecam-01-2025-0069>
- Wang, X., Zhong, W., Huang, K., & Liang, B. (2026). High interest but low adoption: Navigating organizations' journey towards generative artificial intelligence implementation. *International Journal of Information Management*, 87. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2025.103009>
- Wilopo, W. (2026). Strategic Agility, Marketing Agility, and Market-Driving Capability: A Dynamic Capability Perspective on SME Performance in Emerging Markets. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jee-02-2025-0085>
- Wulandhari, N. B. I., Budhwar, P., Mishra, N., Akbar, S., Do, Q., & Milligan, G. (2022). Organizational Resilience to Supply Chain Risks During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *British Journal of Management*, 34(3), 1282–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12648>
- Yi, H.-T., Oh, D., & Amenuvor, F. E. (2023). The effect of SMEs' dynamic capability on operational capabilities and organisational agility. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 54(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v54i1.3696>
- Yoshikuni, A. C., Dwivedi, R., Favaretto, J. E. R., & Zhou, D. (2024). How enterprise information systems strategies-enabled strategy-making influences organizational agility: mediated role of IT-enabled dynamic capabilities in two BRICS countries study. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 37(1), 230–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-06-2023-0275>